

1244008 AD 204 : 1

THE LYCIANS

A Study of Lycian History and Civilisation
to the Conquest of Alexander the Great

I-II

by

TREVOR R. BRYCE

AND

JAN ZAHLE

*Dedicated to the memory of
Otto Mørkholm*

THE LYCIANS - VOLUME I

TREVOR R. BRYCE

The Lycians in Literary and Epigraphic Sources

MUSEUM TUSCULANUM PRESS
COPENHAGEN 1986

Historisches Seminar
der Universität zu Köln

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

THE LYCIANS

I

© Museum Tusculanum Press 1986
Camera-ready manuscript: The University
of New England, Armidale,
Printed in Denmark
by Special-Trykkeriet Viborg a-s
Cover: Kjeld Kjeldsen

ISBN 87-7289-023-1

Contents

Introduction	VII
Proposed contents of vol. II	XI
General Abbreviations	XII
Abbreviations of Literary References	XIV
Map of Lycia	XVI
Chapter 1: The Anatolian Predecessors of the Lycians	1
Chapter 2: The Early Lycians and Greek Literary Tradition	11
Chapter 3: The Inscriptions and the Lycian Language	42
Chapter 4: The Historical Background	99
Chapter 5: Customs and Institutions	115
Chapter 6: Gods and Oracles	172
Chapter 7: Lycia - The Greco-Roman View	203
Registers of Literary References to Lycia	
Register I: Authors	216
Register II: Place names	229
Register III: Personal names	243
Epigraphic Index	253
Bibliography	256

Introduction

This book is the first of a projected 2-volume account of the ancient Lycians. The Lycian civilisation has proved, and is continuing to prove, a rich field of investigation for historians, archaeologists, numismatists, and philologists alike. It is a civilisation with many distinctive features, as illustrated by its abundant archaeological remains, particularly the impressive funerary architecture of many of its cities, by its social customs and institutions, attested in both literary and epigraphic sources, by its numerous coin issues, amongst the most varied ever produced in Asia Minor, and by its peculiar language, which today is only partly understood.

Scholarly interest in Lycia is reflected in a wide range of publications, which have appeared with increasing frequency in the last two decades. Historical, archaeological, numismatic, and philological studies have all contributed important new information to our understanding of the Lycian people and their place within the broad context of the Near Eastern and Greco-Roman civilisations of the 1st millennium B.C. Indeed Lycia provided an important point of contact between the cultural and social traditions of the Near Eastern world on the one hand and those of the Greek and Roman world on the other. Clearly Lycian studies have much to contribute to the fields of Near Eastern and Classical scholarship alike.

In view of the advances that have been made in Lycian research and fieldwork in recent years, the time is appropriate to gather together the information now available to us in a comprehensive treatment of Lycian history and civilisation. No such treatment has in fact been undertaken since the publication of Treuber's *Geschichte der Lykier* in 1887.

The present study is a joint undertaking by T.R. Bryce and J. Zahle. However, while the authors have collaborated closely on all aspects of the study, they are taking individual responsibility for the final preparation and presentation of specific sections of the study. Bryce is primarily responsible for Part 1 (vol. I), which concentrates on literary and epigraphic material. Zahle will be primarily responsible for Part 2

VIII

(to appear in vol. II), which will deal with archaeological and numismatic source material, and with the physical features of the country of Lycia. Part 3 (also to appear in vol. II), which will deal with the Lycian ruling class and aspects of Lycian culture, will be written jointly by both authors.

It is our intention that vol. II will appear within one to two years of the publication of vol. I.

Our study of Lycia will extend from the Late Bronze Age antecedents of the Lycian population to the late 4th century B.C. This terminal point has been chosen advisedly. Our concern will be primarily with the indigenous civilisation of Lycia and the sources of information on which our knowledge of this civilisation is based. By the last decades of the 4th century several of the most important of these sources, including the local coinage, the epichoric inscriptions, and the rock-cut tomb facades, have ceased, reflecting in large measure the increase in foreign influence upon the country, both political and cultural, throughout the 4th century.

Certainly foreign influence in Lycia, particularly Persian and Greek influence, is already evident in the late 6th century; and from the late 5th century Greek influence starts to become very marked indeed. Yet elements of the indigenous civilisation still remain explicit in our sources until the end of the period of the epichoric inscriptions, some time between Alexander's conquest and the end of the 4th century. Undoubtedly a number of indigenous elements persisted in later times, and we shall have cause to refer to some of these in our study. But the lack of source material relating to the indigenous population from the late 4th century onwards, and the corresponding increase, in the centuries which followed, of source material which is Greek or Roman in character, clearly reflect the progressive Hellenisation and subsequently the Romanisation of Lycia as the country was drawn increasingly within the sphere of the Greco-Roman world.

We shall on a number of occasions make reference to aspects of Lycian civilisation in later times, particularly in the Roman imperial period for which we have an abundance of source material. But a detailed treatment of this period falls outside the scope of the present study.

IX

Our aim in writing these volumes is partly to provide a survey of the information currently available on the Lycians in the period we have specified. We hope that this survey will provide a useful source of reference both for scholars and students with a general interest in Lycia as well as for those more deeply immersed in Lycian studies. Of course much of the material with which we shall be dealing is open to different interpretations and conclusions. In such cases we shall be putting forward a number of proposals of our own, which we hope will, in some instances at least, provide new insights into Lycian history and civilisation.

T.R. Bryce - J. Zahle

Acknowledgments for vol. I

I wish to acknowledge, with deep gratitude, the assistance of a number of persons and institutions whose support has greatly facilitated the research and preparation of material for vol. I. My particular thanks are due to -

The Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, for the excellent facilities it provided during the preparation of the first draft.

The University of Queensland for the Special Project Grant it provided to assist with research and travel costs.

The University of New England for providing the facilities for the preparation of the camera-ready copy.

Mrs Noelene Kachel, Miss Elisabeth Macdonald, Mrs Jenny Post for typing the camera-ready copy. Ms. Helen Murray for research assistance.

Finally I give my warmest thanks to my friend and co-author Dr Jan Zahle for his probing criticisms and many excellent suggestions. These have been of inestimable value to me in the preparation of vol. I. I must alone, however, bear the responsibility for any shortcomings this volume may have.

T. R. Bryce

Proposed Contents of Vol. II
(subject to alteration)

Volume II

Part 1

Chapter 1: A Survey of Discoveries: Travellers and Scholars

Chapter 2: The Land and its Cities

Chapter 3: The Tombs

Chapter 4: The Reliefs

Chapter 5: The Coinage

Part 2:

Chapter 6: The Ruling Class

Chapter 7: Lycian Culture

Bibliography

General Index

General Abbreviations

- Act. Arch. - Acta Archaeologica
 AfO - Archiv für Orientforschung
 AJA - American Journal of Archaeology
 AJP - American Journal of Philology
 AO - Archiv Orientalní
 AS - Anatolian Studies
 ATL - Meritt B.D., Wade-Gery H.T., McGregor M.F., *The Athenian Tribute Lists*, vol. I, Harvard, 1939, vol. II, Princeton, 1949, vol. III, Princeton, 1950
 BiOr - Bibliotheca Orientalis
 BOR - The Babylonian and Oriental Record
 BSL - Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris
 BzN - Hamburger Beiträge zur Numismatik
 CAH - Cambridge Ancient History
 CIG - Corpus Inscriptionum Graecorum
 CRAI - Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres
 CTH - Laroche E., *Catalogue des textes hittites*, Paris, 1971
 EA - Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna Tafeln*, Leipzig, 1915
 FGH - Müller C. & T., *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, Paris, 1841-70
 FHG - Jacoby F., *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*, Berlin/Leiden, 1923 et seq.
 Ist. Mitt. - Istanbuler Mitteilungen
 JCS - Journal of Cuneiform Studies
 JDAI - Jahrbuch des deutschen archäologischen Instituts
 JESHO - Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient
 JHS - Journal of Hellenic Studies
 JNES - Journal of Near Eastern Studies
 JNG - Jahrbuch für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte
 JOAI - Jahresheften des Österreichischen archäologischen Institutes
 KBo - Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi
 KIF - Kleinasiatische Forschungen, Weimar, 1927-30
 KUB - Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi

- M - Mörkhölm O. and Neumann G., *Die lykische Münzlegenden*, Göttingen, 1978
 MSL - Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris
 MVAG - Mitteilungen der vorderasiatisch-ägyptischen Gesellschaft
 NC - Numismatic Chronicle
 OGIS - Dittenberger W., *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*
 RA - Revue archéologique
 RE - Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, *Realencyclopädie*
 RHA - Revue hittite et asianique
 RIL - Rendiconti Istituto Lombardo, Scienze e Lettere
 RŠ - Mission de Ras Shamra
 SEG - Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum
 SMBA - Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici
 TAD - Türk Arkeoloji Dergisi
 TAM II - Tituli Asiae Minoris: Tituli Lyciae linguis Graeca et Latina conscripti
 TL - Tituli Asiae Minoris: Tituli Lyciae lingua Lycia conscripti
 ZDMG - Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft

Abbreviations of Literary References

Aelian, nat. an. - de natura animalium
 var. - varia historia
 Antoninus Liberalis, met. - metamorphoses
 Apollodoros, bib. - bibliotheca
 epit. - epitome
 Appian, bell. civ. - bella civilia
 Mith. - Mithridates
 Syr. - Syriaca
 Aristotle, hist. an. - historia animalium
 oecon. - oeconomica
 Arrian, anab. - anabasis Alexandri
 Athenaeus, deip. - deipnosophistae
 Augustine, civ. D. - de civitate Dei

 Cicero, Att. - epistulae ad Atticum
 fam. - epistulae ad familiares
 div. - de divinatione
 leg. agr. - de lege agraria
 Verr. - in Verrem actio
 Clement, protr. - protrepticus
 Constantine Porphyrogenitus, them. - de thematibus

 Dioscorides Pedanius, mat. med. - de materia medica
 Diog. Laert. - Diogenes Laertius

 Euripides, Alk. - Alkestis
 Rhes. - Rhesus
 Sthen. - Sthenoboea
 Eustathius, Dion. Perieg. - Dionysius Periegetes

 Hesiod, theog. - theogonia
 Hierokles, synecd. - synecdemos
 Homer, Il. - Iliad
 Od. - Odyssey
 Horace, carm. - carmina (odes)
 Hyginus, fab. - fabulae

 Isocrates, paneg. - panegyricus

 Justin, hist. phil. - historiae Philippicae

 Kallimachos, hym. - hymni

 Lucan, bell. civ. - bellum civile
 Lucian, bis accus. - bis accusatus
 dial. mer. - dialogi meretricum
 dial. mort. - dialogi mortuorum

 Macrobius, sat. - saturnalia
 Maximus Tyrius, diss. - dissertationes
 Mela (Pomponius), chor. - de chorographia
 Menander, Asp. - Aspis

Ovid, met. - metamorphoses

Parthenius, erot. - erotica pathemata
 Photius, bib. - bibliotheca
 Pindar, Isthm. - Isthmian (odes)
 Ol. - Olympian (odes)
 Pliny, nat. - naturalis historia
 Plutarch, Alex. - Alexander
 Brut. - Brutus
 consol. Apoll. - consolatio ad Apollonium
 def. orac. - de defectu oraculorum
 Kim. - Kimon
 mul. virt. - de mulierum virtute
 sol. an. - de sollertia animalium
 Polyaeus, strat. - strategemata
 Probus, Verg. Georg. - comm. on Vergil's Georgics

Seneca, nat. quaest. - naturales quaestiones
 Servius, Verg. Aen. - comm. on Vergil's Aeneid
 Sophokles, El. - Elektra
 Oed. - Oedipus Tyrannus
 Statius, Theb. - Thebaid
 Stobaeus, flor. - florilegium
 Suetonius, Claud. - Claudius
 Ves. - Vespasian

 Theodoretus, Graec. aff. cur. - Graecarum affectionum curatio
 Theophrastus, hist. plant. - historia plantarum
 Timachidas, Lind. chron. - Lindian Temple Chronicle, ed.
 C. Blinkenberg, 1915/1941

Vergil, Aen. - Aeneid

Zenobius, cent. - centuria

[illegible]

In these words the Egyptian pharaoh Ramesses III refers to the devastation inflicted on the Near Eastern world by the so-called Sea Peoples in the first decades of the 12th century B.C. Whoever these Sea Peoples may have been,² and however much or however little they may have been responsible for the destructions to which Ramesses refers, there can be no doubt that the end of the Late Bronze Age in the Near East was marked by cataclysmic upheavals, the collapse and disappearance of many of the old centres of power, and the break-up of many long-established patterns of settlement. What happened to the Late Bronze Age populations? If they were in fact displaced from their homelands, where did they resettle? What relationships did they have to the peoples who emerged in the Near East during the 1st millennium. B.C.?

If we turn first to the material remains of Lycia, we find that at present there is no conclusive evidence for settlement in the country

2. For a recent discussion of the Sea Peoples, see Sandars, 1978.

prior to the early 1st millennium.³ Indeed the earliest settlement so far discovered in Lycia, the city of Xanthos, appears not to date back before the end of the 8th century (to be discussed in vol. II). Can we conclude from this that Lycia was uninhabited before the 1st millennium?

We might argue that if there had been Bronze Age settlement in the country, at least some evidence of it would have come to light by now. Yet archaeological exploration of Lycia has been far from exhaustive; and even if no further material evidence is forthcoming, we cannot exclude the possibility that there were population groups inhabiting the region during the Bronze Age whose material civilisation was too fragile to leave any detectable trace in the archaeological record. This may well have been so if the groups in question were nomadic or semi-nomadic in character. For the moment, we should leave our options open, and reconsider the matter, in an archaeological context, in vol. II.

Certainly our Greek literary sources suggest that settlement in the country dates back well before the period in which archaeological evidence first comes to light. And if we can attach any credence to the traditions recorded in these sources, the early settlers in Lycia may have had close links with Crete, and perhaps also with mainland Greece (discussed below in Chapter 2). Yet the language which their descendants used in the rock-cut inscriptions of the late 5th and the 4th centuries B.C. puts the Lycians decidedly within an Anatolian context. From recent linguistic studies it is clear that the Lycian language is closely connected with Luwian,⁴ an Indo-European language related to

3. I am excluding from consideration here the Early Bronze Age site of Karatas-Semayuk in the Elmalı plain, excavated by Professor Mellink. (Detailed reports of the excavations appear in *AJA* from 1964 (vol. 68) onwards.) A small amount of Middle Bronze Age material was uncovered on the site, but nothing at all dating to the Late Bronze Age. In any case the Elmalı plain was almost certainly not regarded as part of Lycia in historical times, although a small number of rock-cut tombs of Lycian type were constructed on the fringes of the plain.

4. This was first effectively demonstrated by Tritsch, 1950, 494-518. A detailed study of the relationship between Luwian and Lycian was subsequently made by Laroche in a series of articles appearing in *BSL*: 1957-58, 159-97; 1960, 155-85; 1967, 46-64.

Hittite and widely spoken in western and south-eastern Anatolia during the Late Bronze Age. On linguistic grounds, then, we have a strong case for placing at least some of the antecedents of the Lycians amongst the Late Bronze Age peoples of western Anatolia.

In particular, scholars have long assumed that the Lycians were closely related to the Lukka people, who figure in a number of Late Bronze Age Hittite and Egyptian texts, and were almost certainly part of the Luwian speaking population groups of western Anatolia.⁵ Consequently in any discussion of the Anatolian predecessors of the Lycians, it is a matter of some importance to consider who precisely the Lukka people were, and where they belonged within the political and geographical context of the 2nd millennium B.C.⁶

From various references to Lukka in the Hittite texts (a full list of references appears at the end of this chapter), it is clear that the people designated by this name played a small, but nonetheless significant role in the political affairs of the period. Unfortunately we do not have any documents which deal primarily or specifically with the Lukka people; our knowledge of them depends entirely on a number of incidental references in Hittite treaties, letters, historical records, and religious texts, together with several references to Lukka in Egyptian documents. But in spite of such meagre evidence, we do have enough to indicate something of the nature of the Lukka communities and the people who belonged to them.

During the Late Bronze Age, western Anatolia was dominated by a series of kingdoms known collectively as the Arzawa lands. These kingdoms were under the control of local rulers who were bound by treaties of vassalhood to the Hittite king in Hattusa.⁷ However in addition to the Arzawa lands, a number of smaller countries were also

5. On the possible connection between the words Lukka and Luwiya, see Laroche, 1976, 18.

6. For a more detailed discussion of the Lukka people, see Bryce, 1979b.

7. A recent comprehensive treatment of the Arzawa lands is given by Heinhold-Krahmer, 1977. For a general discussion of the nature and scope of Hittite treaties with vassal states, see Pirenne, 1950. On the status of the various Hittite subject states, see Goetze, 1957, 95-109.

located in western Anatolia. For the most part they too were subject to Hittite authority, although they ranked well below the major vassal kingdoms in terms of their military and political importance. In many cases they were probably not kingdoms as such, but groups of communities which had no significant degree of overall political coherence.

Lukka was a case in point. In no sense was it a coherent political entity; we know of no kings of Lukka, no treaties of vassalhood between Lukka and the Hittite king, and no one person or city could speak or act on behalf of Lukka as a whole. In other words, the term Lukka, or Lukka lands,⁸ was used not in reference to a state with a defined political organisation, but rather to a conglomerate of independent communities, presumably with close ethnic affinities but with no real sense of a common political identity.

The relationship between these communities and the Hittites was a tenuous one, at best. While from time to time they paid tribute to the Hittite kings during the period of the New Kingdom (c. 1460-1180 B.C.), the Hittite texts clearly indicate that the Lukka people were often fractious, rebellious, and susceptible to the influence of foreign insurrectionists. Indeed the first *likely* reference to Lukka in the Hittite texts places it in an anti-Hittite alliance of 22 countries - the so-called Assuwan Confederacy, which did battle with and was ultimately defeated by the Hittite king Tudhaliya I early in the New Kingdom (mid 15th century B.C.).⁹

8. As Houwink ten Cate points out, the plural term 'Lukka lands' appears to occur only once in the texts (namely KUB XXI 6a. 4, a text attributable either to Urhi-Tesub or Hattusili III). On this basis, Houwink ten Cate suggests that 'before and around 1250 B.C. the term Lukka lands had a wider and more threatening connotation than before' (1970, 73, n. 105).

9. The rebellion is recorded in the parallel texts KUB XXIII 11 and 12, translated in Garstang and Gurney, 1959, 121-23. The text was originally assigned to Tudhaliya IV, one of the last kings of the Hittite New Kingdom. However, it is now virtually certain that the text belongs to an earlier Tudhaliya - Tudhaliya I who reigned during the 15th century B.C. For the redating of a number of the Hittite texts from late to early in the New Kingdom, see (for example) Houwink ten Cate, 1970.

In addition to what we find in the Hittite texts, information about the Lukka people is provided by several non-Hittite sources. For instance, Lukka figures amongst the Hittite allies in the Egyptian records of the battle of Kadesh, fought between the Hittite King Muwatalli and the pharaoh Ramesses II in the fifth year of Ramesses' reign (1286 or 1274 B.C.).¹⁰ Presumably Lukka men took part in the conflict as subject-allies of the Hittite king. But we cannot be entirely certain of this. The list of Hittite allies includes contingents from countries which were not subject to Hittite rule - e.g. Masa, Karkisa, Kaska - and there can be little doubt that a number of these contingents were fighting on the Hittite side purely in a mercenary capacity.¹¹ It may be that the Lukka contingent also fell into this category.

In other Late Bronze Age texts we learn that the Lukka people had a sea-going capacity of some significance. Of particular importance in this connection is one of the letters from the Amarna archives. The letter, written by the king of Alasiya (= Cyprus, or part thereof)¹² to the pharaoh Akhenaton, makes reference to yearly attacks which 'people of the Land of Lukki' had been making on Alasiyan territory:

Why does my brother speak this word to me? 'Should my brother not know that?' I have not been able to do such a thing as that while the people of the Land of Lukki take a small (?) city in my land year after year. My brother, you say to me: 'The people of your land are with them.' But I, my brother, do not know

10. For a selection of the extensive secondary literature on the battle of Kadesh, see CAH II. 2³, 1975, 952. The battle took place in the 5th year of Ramesses II's reign. Three dates have been proposed for Ramesses' year of accession - 1304, 1291, and 1279 B.C. Although the middle one of these is now the most widely quoted, several scholars have recently argued for the lowest dating; see, e.g. Wente E.F. and Van Siden III C.C., 'A Chronology of the New Kingdom' in *Studies in Honor of George R. Hughes*, Chicago (Oriental Institute), 1976, 217-61.

11. This is supported by the statement in the Egyptian records that the Hittite king 'left no silver in his land, he stripped it of all its possessions and gave them to all the foreign countries in order to bring them with him to fight' (Gardiner, 1975, 8, P50).

12. For a discussion of the identification of Alasiya with Cyprus, see Catling, 1975, 201-05; see also the references in Knapp, 1980, 44, n. 1.

that (they) are with them. If the people of my land are (with them), then write to me and I will act according to my will. You do not know the people of my land. I have not done such a thing. (But) if the people of my land have done (such a thing), then act according to your will.

Now, my brother, since you have not sent (back) my messenger, a brother of the king should send this tablet. What your messenger does will be told to me. Further, when in former times have your fathers done such a thing to my fathers? But now, my brother, do not take this to heart.¹³

It is clear from this letter that the 'people of the Land of Lukki' were engaged in seasonal plundering raids on Alasiyan territory, and had now apparently extended their freebooting activities to Egypt. In so doing they had caused some tension in the relations between Alasiya and Egypt; the letter was evidently written in response to accusations by Akhenaton that Alasiyans were acting in collaboration with the Lukki people. But for our purposes the significant point is that if these 'Lukki people' came from Anatolian Lukka, as seems most likely, then they were obviously seafarers sufficiently well acquainted with the eastern Mediterranean coastlands, and sufficiently well equipped, to harass coastal cities in the area with regular and successful piratical raids. This may have an important bearing on the (likely) resettlement of some of the Lukka people in Lycia in the late 2nd or early 1st millennium.

Lukka men also figure in the account of the Sea Peoples' onslaught on Egypt during the reign of the pharaoh Merneptah (c. 1208 B.C.).¹⁴ From their inclusion in Merneptah's account of the invasion, we can again conclude that the Lukka people had a substantial sea-going capacity, although this particular episode was little more than a prelude to the main movements of Sea People which took place the following century, as recorded by Ramesses III.

At all events, the seafaring activities of the Lukka people clearly indicate that Lukka territory extended to the Anatolian coast, a conclusion confirmed by the Ugaritic tablet RS 20. 238. In this document Ammurapi, the king of Ugarit, informs the Alasiyan king that

13. For the text see Knudtzon, 1915, 292-94, no. 38, and Mercer, 1939, 200-02.

14. For the text see Breasted, 1962, 243, sec. 579.

he has sent his entire fleet to the waters off the coast of Lukka, at a time when the Sea Peoples were beginning to advance south.¹⁵ The document obviously has an important bearing on the actual location of Lukka, although it does not make clear whether the coast in question is the Mediterranean or the Aegean coast. Strategic considerations, however, point to the latter possibility, and Astour, (1965, 255) may well be right in his claim that the intention in sending the Ugaritic fleet to the Lukka coast was 'to defend the passage from the Aegean to the Mediterranean'.

A further pointer to Lukka's location is the likely identification of Millawanda/Milawata of the Hittite texts with the site of Classical Miletos. From several of the texts we can conclude that the region in which a number of the Lukka communities were situated lay close and probably adjacent to the territory of Millawanda.¹⁶ In fact Millawanda itself may have been a Lukka settlement in origin. I have suggested elsewhere that through a process of association of place-names in various Hittite texts, we can construct a list of the settlements which lay within or near the territory designated as Lukka territory in these texts (Bryce, 1974, 399-401). The settlements in question are:

Arinna	Hinduwa	Kuwalapassa	Wallarimma
Attarimma	Huwarsanassa	Mutamutassa	Zumanti
Dalawa	Iyalanda	Suruta	Zumarri

As we shall see, several of these names (notably Arinna and Dalawa) appear to have counterparts amongst the place names of 1st millennium Lycia.

Now if we use the Millawanda/Milawata-Miletos identification as a starting point, and bear in mind that Millawanda and Lukka territory lay close together, we can conclude that the main area of Lukka settlement lay in western Caria and extended to the Aegean Sea somewhere in the

15. Ugaritica 5, 1968, no. 24, 87-88.

16. Macqueen's proposal to locate Millawanda and Lukka in the north west of Anatolia (1968, 175-76, 1975, 38 (map)), is in my view quite untenable. Apart from other considerations, it would be very difficult to explain the reference to the Lukka lands in the Ugaritic text referred to above if in fact Lukka was situated in this region.

vicinity of Miletos. At the same time, we cannot rule out the possibility that there were enclaves of Lukka settlers in other parts of Late Bronze Age Anatolia. I have in fact suggested that a second group of Lukka settlements may have been situated further east in the vicinity of what became known as Lykaonia in the 1st millennium (Bryce, 1974, 404). But even if this suggestion is correct, the 'western' Lukka communities seem to have played the more important role in Anatolian affairs.

Very likely the western communities had some contact with the Late Bronze Age Aegean civilisations, perhaps by way of Millawanda. As we shall see, Minoan Crete and Mycenaean Greece both figure in the literary traditions which are concerned with the origins of the 1st millennium Lycians. There can be little doubt that these traditions are, in part at least, authentic survivals of the Late Bronze Age, and that Millawanda/Miletos was a main point of contact between the predecessors of the Lycians and the civilisations of the Aegean world.¹⁷

We shall be considering the literary traditions, and their possible historical implications, in Chapter 2.

References to Lukka in the Late Bronze Age texts

The texts cited below refer either to Lukka as a whole, or to the individual communities which lay within, or near, the Lukka complex.

1. *CTH 142*: the Annals of Tudhaliya (I) (mid 15th cent.), translated in Garstang and Gurney, 1959, 121-23. *LJugga* (= Lukka) is the likely restoration of the first name in the list of countries constituting the anti-Hittite 'Assuwan Confederacy' (see, most recently, Bryce, 1979b, 3, n. 9).
2. *CTH 47*: the Indictment of Madduwatta (late 15th cent.), translated in Goetze, 1968, Bryce, 1982b, 33-38. The document contains references to Dalawa and Hinduwa (secs. 13-15), Zumanti,

17. A recent discussion of Aegean influence in the Maeander region appears in Mee, 1978, 121-56.

Wallarimma, Iyalanti (= Iyalanda), Zumarri, Mutamutassa, Attarimma (secs. 24 and 29).

3. *EA 38*: letter from the king of Alasiya to the pharaoh Akhenaton (mid 14th cent.), translated in Knudtzon, 1915, 292-94, Mercer, 1939, 200-02, Bryce, 1982b, 43-44. The document refers to piratical raids on Alasiya and the Egyptian coast by the people of the land of Lukki.
4. *CTH 378*: the Plague Prayers of Mursili (II) (last quarter of 14th cent.), translated in Gurney, 1940, 25-33, and Goetze, in Pritchard, 1969, 396. The document refers to Lukka as one of the countries which have renounced their Hittite allegiance.
5. *CTH 61*: the Annals of Mursili (II) (last quarter of 14th cent.), translated in Goetze, 1967, and Bryce (in part only), 1982b, 44-48. The document refers to the refusal by Uhhaziti, king of Arzawa, to surrender to Mursili refugees from Huwarsanassa, Attarimma, and Suruta, and the ensuing Hittite military campaign against Arzawa undertaken by Mursili in the third and fourth years of his reign (secs. 12ff.).
6. *CTH 76*: the treaty between Muwatalli and Alaksandu, vassal ruler of Wilusa, (1st quarter of 13th cent.), translated in Friedrich, 1930, 50-82, and Garstang and Gurney (in part only), 1959, 102-03. The document refers to Lukka as a possible trouble spot in the west (sec. 14).
7. The Kadesh inscriptions (1st quarter of 13th cent.), translated in Gardiner, 1975. Lukka figures amongst the Hittite allies listed in the Egyptian records of the battle, fought between Muwatalli and Ramesses (II) (*P40-P53*).
8. *CTH 82*: the Lukka lands appear within the context of a series of military campaigns conducted by the Hittites during the reign of Urhi-Tesub (c. 1282-75) or that of his successor Hattusili (III) (c. 1275-50).
9. *CTH 181*: the Tawagalawa letter (2nd quarter of 13th cent.), translated in Sommer, 1932, 3-19, Garstang and Gurney (in part only), 1959, 111-14, Bryce, 1982b, 56-60. The document, probably written by Hattusili (III), refers to insurrectionist activity in western Anatolia, involving Attarimma and Iyalanda (secs. 1, 2, and 4).

10. *CTH 255*: a document dating to the reign of Tudhaliya (IV) (c. 1250-20) in which Hittite frontier-commanders are instructed not to let anyone cross the borders of the Hittite homeland from Azzi, Kaska, or Lukka (sec. 10), translated in von Schuler, 1957, 24.
11. *CTH 182*: the Milawata letter, dating (probably) to the reign of Tudhaliya (IV). The translation appearing in Garstang and Gurney, 1959, 114-15, can now be revised and supplemented on the basis of a new join-piece discovered by Hoffner, as discussed by Hoffner, 1983. See also Singer, 1984, 214-16, and Bryce, 1985. The document refers to Arinna, apparently the community of that name lying in or near Lukka, in a context which is not altogether clear.
12. Egyptian record of the Sea Peoples' incursions in Egypt during the reign of Merneptah (c. 1213-04), translated in Breasted, 1962, 243, sec. 579. Lukka figures in the list of raiders recorded in the Egyptian account.
13. *RS 20. 238*: letter from Ammurapi, king of Ugarit, to the king of Alasiya (end of 13th cent.), text and translation in Nougayrol, 1968 (*Ugaritica* 5), 87-89, no. 24. Ammurapi informs the Alasiyan king that he has sent his entire fleet to the waters off the coast of Lukka (presumably in an attempt to stem the southward movement of the Sea Peoples).
14. *KBo XVI 83, II, 7* (included in *CTH 242*), from a votive list referring to six calumets of silver from the people of Lukka.
15. *KUB XLII 11, II, 24-27*, from an inventory of coffer referring to two minas (and) two shekels of gold from Lukka.
16. The Ilgin monument, recently discovered in the area to the north west of Konya (see Mellink, *AJA* 76, 1972, 171), names Lukka in a religious context relating to the foundation of sanctuaries (see Laroche, 1976, 17-18).

2. THE EARLY LYCIANS AND GREEK LITERARY TRADITION

Part A The Traditions

In our Greek literary sources, Lycia provides the setting for a number of well known mythological and legendary traditions; for example, it is the land ruled by Sarpedon and Glaukos, leaders of the Lycian contingent at Troy, it is the homeland of the fire-breathing monster Chimaera and the setting for the conflicts of Bellerophon, it serves as a place of refuge for the goddess Leto in her flight from the wrath of Hera, and it is the country occupied by the Termilae, refugee emigrants from Crete.

Of prime interest to the historian is the extent to which these traditions can be used for historical purposes. What degree of historical reality can be attributed to them? What use can be made of them when one is attempting to reconstruct early Lycian history? These questions are of obvious importance to our present investigation since we have so few sources of information relating to Lycia before the Persian conquest of the country c. 540 B.C. (*Herodotos* 1.176). What happened in Lycia prior to this time is very much a matter for speculation; and for this we inevitably turn our attention to the traditions which the literary sources make known to us. One need hardly point out the extreme caution that is necessary in attempting to use these sources for the purpose of historical reconstruction - the more so as they are foreign, non-Lycian sources. But we certainly cannot overlook the possibility that they sometimes do reflect, even if in a very indirect, obscure, or distorted way, a number of events which actually took place and which became embedded in local Lycian tradition.

But can we be any more precise than this? Is it at all possible to distinguish in these sources what may have an authentic historical base, what may contain a few grains of truth, and what is probably no more than mere invention?

In attempting to answer these questions we will find it useful to begin with a brief outline of three 'mainstream' traditions relating to early Lycia: (1) the tradition of Lycian participation in the Trojan War,

(2) the Bellerophon tradition, (3) the Termilae tradition.¹ These will provide us with a convenient frame of reference for the discussion and the historical conclusions which follow in Part B of this chapter. I should however stress that my purpose in this chapter is not to undertake a detailed investigation of the traditions themselves. Rather it is to consider the circumstances which may have given rise to early settlement in Lycia, and the extent to which the literary traditions may reflect these circumstances as well as the historical events in which the early Lycians or their ancestors were involved. In discussing the traditions, I will generally refer only to the most important of the sources in which they are recorded. A full list of references can be found by consulting Register I (pp. 216-18).

(1) *The tradition of Lycian participation in the Trojan War*

This tradition provides us with an obvious starting point in considering the treatment of early Lycia in the literary sources. In the *Iliad*, the Lycians under the leadership of Sarpedon and Glaukos figure as the most prominent of Troy's allies in the war against the Greeks. From the long list of references to Lycian participation in the conflict,² it is clear how extensive a role Homer assigned to the Lycians. Indeed they completely overshadow all the other allies of Troy in the treatment which they are accorded in the *Iliad*. This is a matter of particular note, given the remoteness of their homeland from the scene of the action.

Lycia appears last in the list of allies detailed in the so-called Trojan Catalogue (*Il.* 2.816-77), a catalogue which was almost certainly intended to indicate a rough geographical progression extending from the Troad in the north to Lycia in the far south. And quite clearly Homer accepted as a matter of course the location of Sarpedon's and Glaukos' kingdom in the country known as Lycia in the 1st millennium

B.C. Yet Homer was also conscious of the large distance separating Lycia from the rest of Troy's allies,³ and the apparent lack of motivation for Lycia's participation in the conflict. This is clearly implied when Sarpedon rebukes Hektor for the lack of spirit shown by the Trojans in battle, in contrast to the Lycians whose own country is in no danger (*Il.* 5.471-92).⁴ The *Iliad* in fact offers no clear explanation for the involvement of Sarpedon's contingent at Troy although much is made of the Lycians' aggressiveness and fighting qualities. Such is their reputation among the Greeks at Troy (*Il.* 12.346-47), and it is the Lycian leaders who take the initiative on several occasions - for instance when the Trojans break through the walls built by the Achaeans for the defence of their ships (*Il.* 12.310-471). The overall picture, then, is of a fiercely warlike people who have come from a far-off country to fight on the Trojan side, but with no apparent motive, no apparent incentive.

Lycia itself is depicted in the *Iliad* as a flourishing and prosperous land - fertile, deep-soiled, and rich in crops and orchards (e.g. *Il.* 12.313-14). But we should note that its inhabitants seem to have been confined to only one part of what we generally regard as Lycia - namely the Xanthos valley. This is indicated by the frequency with which the names Lycia and the Xanthos river are closely linked in the *Iliad*, to the point where they are virtually inseparable from each other (e.g. *Il.* 2.877, 5.479, 6.172, 12.313). There can be little doubt that for Homer Lycia and the Xanthos valley were one and the same.

In addition to Sarpedon and Glaukos, the *Iliad* contains references to another leader in the Trojan War with Lycian connections - namely Pandaros, son of Lykaon. In Book 5 of the *Iliad* Pandaros is on two occasions associated with Lycia; in line 105 he claims that he came from Lycia in order to take part in the war against the Greeks, and in line 173 his association with Lycia is implicit in Aeneas' claim that his skill as an archer exceeds that of any other man, whether Trojan or Lycian.

1. I have not included here the tradition of Leto's arrival in Lycia. This is probably a late tradition; at least it is not attested before the 4th century B.C. For further discussion, see below in Chapter 6, pp. 175-77.

2. See the entry under Homer in Register I.

3. This is indicated by expressions such as *ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐκ Λυκίας* 'from far-off Lycia' (*Il.* 2.877) and *τὸ πολὺ γὰρ Λυκίῃ* 'for Lycia is far away' (*Il.* 5.479).

4. Cf. Glaukos' speech to Hektor (*Il.* 17. 139-68), especially the threat of the withdrawal of the Lycian contingent (*Il.* 17. 154-55).

But these references present a problem, since elsewhere in the *Iliad* Homer states that Pandaros came from Zeleia on the Aesepos river in the Troad (e.g. *Il.* 2.824-27, 4.103 and 121). Moreover, there is no attempt in the *Iliad* to reconcile Pandaros' role as a "Lycian" with that of Sarpedon and Glaukos. Certainly there is no point of contact between Pandaros on the one hand and Sarpedon and Glaukos on the other, nor is there any attempt to explain the presence of two sets of Lycian leaders at Troy. And a further point is that in spite of Pandaros' apparent Lycian origin referred to in Book 5 of the *Iliad*, the forces under his command are never referred to as Lycians. On the contrary, they are invariably called Trojans.⁵ Yet we can hardly accept, as has sometimes been suggested, that the Homeric references indicate that there were originally two Lycias - a northern one in the Troad as well as a southern one⁶ - for this would still not explain why the forces commanded by Pandaros are called Trojans and not Lycians.

I believe that there is another more feasible explanation to account for the inconsistency in Homer. But I shall leave that for discussion in Part B of this chapter. For the moment it will be sufficient to note that the references to Pandaros in Book 5 of the *Iliad* suggest some form of link between Lycia and a folk or cult hero called Pandaros at least by the end of the 8th century B.C. Later references to Pandaros in Lycia suggest that he may have been associated most closely with the western Lycian city Pinara.⁷

(2) The Bellerophon tradition

In Book 6 of the *Iliad*, the well known and much discussed

5. In the Trojan Catalogue it is specifically stated that he led a Trojan contingent (*Il.* 2. 826), and elsewhere Pandaros refers to himself as a leader of Trojans (*Il.* 5. 200 and 211).

6. See Strabo, 12. 4. 6, 12. 8. 4, 13. 1. 7, and Eustathius, 353. 25, 448. 42. The view that there were two Lycias was supported by Treuber (1887, 18) who suggested that the northern Lycians were eventually displaced by the Cimmerians and moved south, perhaps into Cilicia, where all trace of them had disappeared by the end of the 7th century B.C.

7. See Strabo 14. 3. 5, and cf. CIG add. 4269b.

confrontation between Glaukos and the Greek Diomedes takes place, during the course of which Glaukos gives a detailed account of the exploits of his grandfather Bellerophon (*Il.* 6.144-211). According to this account, Bellerophon came originally from Ephyre in Argos,⁸ the kingdom ruled by Proitos. Proitos' wife Anteia (or Stheneboea)⁹ became enamoured of Bellerophon, but when he rejected her advances, she falsely accused him before her husband of attempting to seduce her.¹⁰ In response to her accusation, Proitos sent Bellerophon to Lycia with a letter to be delivered to the Lycian king (Iobates/Amphianax), Proitos' father-in-law. Unknown to Bellerophon, the letter contained instructions for his execution.

The Lycian king entertained Bellerophon for nine days before asking to see the letter from his son-in-law. When he had read its contents, he apparently could not bring himself to kill his guest on the spot, and so ordered him to engage in combat with three formidable enemies of the kingdom - the Chimaera, the Solymians and the Amazons - assuming that he would be killed in one of these encounters. Yet the plan misfired. With the assistance of his winged horse Pegasos, Bellerophon triumphed over all his adversaries, capping his performance by slaying the select band of Lycian warriors sent by the king to ambush and kill him. Finally, in recognition of his achievements, the king gave him his daughter's hand in marriage, along with half his kingdom.

We should note that the ostensible reason for this lengthy digression in the *Iliad* is to establish that the Lycian kings were partly of Greek descent; and the travels and exploits of Bellerophon allegedly explain

8. Malten identified Ephyre with Corinth (1944, 7-9), whereas Dunbabin claimed that it was the 'lost city which Corinth annexed' (1953, 1177). But see Astour, 1967, 251. For the suggestion that it is to be identified with the town of this name attested in Thesprotia on the west coast of Greece, see Frei, 1978, 822-24.

9. Proitos' wife, called Anteia in Homer's account, is elsewhere known as Stheneboea (cf. Apollodoros, bib. 2. 2. 1 and Pindar Ol. 13. 85). Euripides wrote a tragedy based on the legend with the title Stheneboea. For the surviving fragments of this tragedy, see Nauck², 1889, 567-72, frags. 661-72.

10. There are several well known parallels to this story, e.g. the Biblical account of Joseph and Potiphar's wife (Gen. 39).

how this came about. In the course of the narrative, we are provided with details of Bellerophon's family line; and these, supplemented by several references in later sources, enable us to construct for Sarpedon and Glaukos a genealogical table in which both Argive and Lycian elements are represented:¹¹

<u>Argive line</u>		<u>Lycian line</u>	
Aeolos			
Sisyphus			
Glaukos		Iobates/Amphianax	
Bellerophon	m.	Philonoe	
Isander	Hippolochos	Laodameia	Zeus
	Glaukos	Sarpedon	

If we accept that the Glaukos-Diomedes episode is an authentic part of the *Iliad*,¹² (in the past some doubts have been expressed about this),¹³ then the Argive-Lycian link which it indicates is clearly a matter that deserves further consideration. It is in fact one of several traditions which raise the question of possible family or ethnic links between the Lycians (or their Bronze Age ancestors) and Greeks. We shall be returning to this question later in the chapter.

Of Bellerophon's exploits, the one which is most frequently highlighted in Greek art and literature is his conflict with the Chimaera, the fire-breathing monster, part lion, part serpent, part goat. The Chimaera episode is typical of a very common Greek mythological motif – the motif of a mortal or divine hero pitted in combat with a monster,

11. The details in this table which are not supplied by Homer come from other literary sources; e.g. Apollodoros, who gives the alternative names of the Lycian king (Iobates/Amphianax) and the names of Bellerophon's father and grandfather (bib. 2. 2. 1, 2. 3. 1).

12. As Schadewalt has pointed out, abrupt digressions of this kind are a typical feature of the *Iliad* (1938, 77); see also Peppermüller, 1962, 7.

13. E.g. by Forsdyke, who considered it an invention by Ionian genealogists in an attempt to give an Aiolid ancestry to the Lycian kings (1956, 89).

as illustrated also in Perseus' conflict with Medusa, in Zeus' triumph over Typhoeus, and in Herakles' struggle with the Lernaean Hydra.¹⁴ Very likely the Greek concept of a monster-slayer and almost certainly the motif of the winged horse originated in the Near East,¹⁵ whence they were transmitted to Greece and eventually given expression in a number of different versions in Greek art and literature.

But why and how did the Chimaera tradition first come to be associated with Lycia? Was it imported into the country? Was the association purely a literary one? Did it arise out of some phenomenon or event which was local in origin?

From our literary sources we know of several attempts made in antiquity to provide a rational explanation for the tradition by associating it with a local phenomenon or a particular episode belonging to the country's legendary past. The following suggestions are recorded by Plutarch (*mul. virt.* 247-48): (a) the Chimaera was in origin a wild boar which devastated the territory of the city of Xanthos; (b) it was a mountain which scorched and dried up the Lycian crops by reflecting the intense rays of the summer sun upon them; in this case Bellerophon 'slew' the Chimaera by cutting away the smoothest part of the mountain which was causing most of the damage; (c) the tradition originated with Chimarrhos, commander of a pirate fleet from a 'Lycian colony' in the vicinity of Zeleia in the Troad; Chimarrhos' flagship had a lion as its figurehead and a serpent at its stern, and his fleet travelled south to Lycia where it terrorised the populations of the coastal cities and made the sea unsafe to travel.¹⁶

14. The close relationship that exists between a number of these episodes is indicated in Hesiod's *Theogony*, in which Cerberus, Hydra, and Chimaera are represented as the offspring of Echidna and Typhaon (*theog.* 306-25).

15. See (for a brief discussion) Yalouris, 1975, xv and plates 1-5 depicting the winged horse in Assyrian and Hittite art. Tritsch argued that the Lycian Chimaera was a local variety of the monster appearing in Neo-Hittite art (1951).

16. Note also the explanation given by Servius, who refers to the Chimaera as a mountain in Cilicia whose peak is ablaze; near its summit lions are to be found, around its middle goats graze, and around its base are serpents. Bellerophon made the area habitable; hence the origin of his conflict with and triumph over the Chimaera (*ad Verg. Aen.* 6. 288).

The tradition of the fire-breathing monster also calls to mind the fire phenomenon of eastern Lycia now known as the *yanar*, located on a mountain, called Chimaera in the literary sources, a few kilometres north west of Olympos.¹⁷ One can see the phenomenon to its best effect by approaching Lycia on a dark night by boat across the gulf of Antalya. The *yanar* will be observed glimmering through the dark of the Lycian mountains. On closer inspection, however, it is rather less impressive, no more than an aperture in the ground from which issues a pure, smokeless flame.¹⁸

One of the first Europeans to visit the site of the *yanar* was Captain Francis Beaufort, commander of the British ship *Frederikssteen* during a survey of the southern coast of Turkey under the orders of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty in 1811 and 1812. According to Beaufort's Turkish guide, the *yanar* 'was never accompanied by earthquakes or noises; and it ejected no stones, smoke, nor any noxious vapours, nothing but a brilliant and perpetual flame which no quantity of water could quench. The shepherds, he added, frequently cooked their victuals there; and he affirmed, with equal composure, that it was notorious that the *yanar* would not roast meat which had been stolen' (Beaufort, 1818, 46). Pliny (*nat.* 2. 110. 236) also alludes to the *yanar*'s perpetual quality, observing that Mt. Chimaera burns with a flame that does not die by day or night; he refers to the claim made by Ktesias of Knidos that water only makes it burn all the more intensely.

Is it possible that the *yanar* was the origin of the myth of the fire-breathing monster encountered by Bellerophon? Attractive as this possibility may seem at first sight, it is highly unlikely. In the first place, the area in which the *yanar* is located lay well outside Lycian territory until many centuries after the Bellerophon episode appeared in the *Iliad*. In the second place, none of the attempts made by ancient writers to find rational explanations for the tradition ever suggest that it was connected with the *yanar*. And in the third place, the ancient sources generally locate the monster in a quite different area, the

17. See Pliny *nat.* 2. 110. 236-37, and cf. Maximus Tyrius, *diss.* 8. 8, who refers to the mountain as Mt. Olympos.

18. See the account given by Bean, 1979b, 136-38.

Kragos range in western Lycia, which was almost certainly part of the area settled by the first Lycians. It was a notoriously dangerous area in early times, not only because it was supposedly haunted by the Chimaera, but also because of its infestation by bandits (*Euripides, Sthen. frag.* 669 (Nauck²); *Strabo* 14.3.5).

We should conclude, then, that the name Chimaera was only secondarily associated with the *yanar*, and was probably a fairly late association at that. And since we cannot be sure that the Chimaera tradition did in fact arise in a Lycian setting, we must leave open the possibility that it originated elsewhere and was only later transplanted to Lycia.

Apart from the Chimaera, Bellerophon's opponents in Lycia included the Amazons and the Solymians. There is little that can usefully be said about the Amazons in our present discussion, beyond noting that it is only in the Bellerophon tradition that they are associated with Lycia. In other traditions they are assigned a more northerly location - along the northern and western coasts of Asia Minor, and in the latter case especially in the region later known as Aeolis and Ionia.¹⁹

The Solymians, however, are quite securely located in the south west of Asia Minor, where they are associated in particular with Lycia and Pisidia. According to Herodotos (1.173), they were an aboriginal population of Lycia who were later known as Milyans, and Lycia was in fact called Milyas at the time of the arrival of the Termilae, migrants from Crete. The association between the Solymians and Pisidia is first attested by Strabo (13.4.16), who claims that the inhabitants of the Pisidian city Termessos were called Solymians, and notes that the mountain at whose foot the town lay was known as Mt. Solymos.²⁰ In fact Stephanus Byzantinus (s.v. Πισιδία) equated the Pisidians as a

19. Ephesos, for example, was said to have been ruled by an Amazon queen named Smyrna (cf. Diodoros 3. 54, Strabo 12. 3. 21, 14. 1. 4, Servius Verg. Aen. 4.345) and the ancient shrine of Artemis at Ephesos was supposedly founded by Amazons (cf. Pausanias 7. 2. 7, Tacitus, ann. 3.61).

20. Kretschmer points out that Strabo's statement is confirmed by epigrams of the town (1940, 111). See also Heberdey in RE V A 737. 39ff.

whole with the early Solymians, making them (i.e. the Pisidians) the descendants of Solymnos, son of Zeus and Chaldene.²¹ But Strabo seems to regard the Solymians as a separate ethnic group, speaking a language different from that of the Pisidians. It is conceivable that one branch of this group became the basic stock of the population of Termessos, and that in the region of Termessos certain elements of the old Solymian culture may have survived in later times. Perhaps some of these elements were reflected in the cult of Zeus Solymeus, attested at Termessos in the Roman imperial period.²²

The Solymians also figure in a curious tradition related by Plutarch (*def. orac.* 21 = 421D-E). According to this tradition, they were neighbours of the Lycians and paid special honour to the god Kronos. However Kronos killed their three archons Arsalos, Dryos, and Trosobios, fled the land, and his cult was abandoned by the Solymians.²³ His victims were deified under the names of the σκληροὶ or σκερροὶ θεοὶ and invoked by the Lycians in public and private imprecations. We shall be discussing some of the possible implications of this tradition in Chapter 6. For the moment we shall simply note that it provides us with another reference to the Solymians as early inhabitants of south-western Asia Minor.

While we obviously cannot draw any detailed conclusions about the Solymians from the information available to us, our literary sources provide us with reasonable grounds for assuming that they represent a distinct population group who at one time occupied parts of Lycia and Pisidia and may well have been amongst the earliest inhabitants in this region.

21. See also Treuber, 1887, 22-23, n. 1.

22. See CIG 4366 k and q. See also the reference to the temple of Zeus Solymeus at Termessos in Vermeule, 1968, 226.

23. See the discussion of Robert, 1949, 50-54. Robert suggests that the three officials killed by Kronos belonged to the Lycians, and that their deaths took place in the course of some conflict between Lycians and Solymians. This, he claims, would make better sense of the passage in Plutarch. Note that in Eusebius the three officials are designated as ἀρχηγέτες.

(3) The Termilae

In addition to his role in Homeric tradition as one of the Lycian leaders at Troy, Sarpedon also figures in another body of Greek literary tradition in association with a group of Cretan immigrants to Anatolia called Termilae. According to Herodotos (1.173), the Termilae resettled in Lycia under the leadership of Sarpedon, a Cretan prince who was forced to flee his country after dynastic disputes with his brother Minos.²⁴ In a tradition recorded by Apollodoros (*bib.* 3.1.1), Minos and Sarpedon quarrelled over a boy Miletos, who favoured Sarpedon. Minos declared war and emerged triumphant. The others fled, Miletos to Caria where he founded the city of Miletos, Sarpedon to Cilicia where he was received by his uncle Cilix and subsequently established as king of Lycia. In a slightly different tradition, Miletos was founded by Sarpedon himself, and was named after the Cretan city of his origin (*Strabo* 12.8.5, 14.1.6 - quoting Ephoros).

Several ancient writers and commentators were aware of the apparent discrepancy in the traditions which on the one hand represented Sarpedon as a participant in the Trojan War and on the other as a refugee from Crete. And various attempts were made to reconcile the traditions - for example by making Sarpedon live for three generations after attaining the kingship of Lycia (*Apollodoros*, *bib.* 3.1.2), or by making the Lycian leader at Troy the grandson of the migrant from Crete (*Diodoros* 5.79.3). But clearly the 'discrepancy' is simply an instance of the practice of associating various events in a country's legendary and/or historical past with a local hero, regardless of any chronological inconsistencies that may arise. We might compare, for example, the exploits of Theseus who in Greek legendary tradition is a contemporary of the Greek warriors who participated in the Trojan War, but also appears in Thucydides (2.15) as the author of *synoikismos* in Attica.

What is of greater interest and significance for our present discussion is the claim that Lycia was settled by emigrants from Crete called the Termilae. We might also mention here a further, though less

24. Cf. *Strabo* 12. 8. 5, 14. 3. 10.

direct, reference to the Termilae in a tradition recorded by the 5th century poet Panyasis.

Ἐνθα δ' ἔναυε μέγας Τρεμίλης καὶ ἔγχε θυγάτρα,
 νύμφην Ὀγγύλην,²⁵ ἣν Πραξιόδωκον καλέουσιν,
 Σίβρῳ ἐπ' ἀργυρέῳ παρὰ Διὶ δυνήεντι.
 Τῆς δ' ὅλοοι παῖδες Τλῶος Ἐάνθος Πίναρος τε
 καὶ Κράγος, ὅς κρατέων πάσος ληΐζειτ' ἀρούρας.
 (Panyasis, ap. Steph. Byz. s.v. Τρεμίλη).²⁶

Clearly we are to see in the name Tremiles, father of the eponymous city-founders Tloos, Xanthos, Pinaros, and Kragos by the nymph Praxidike, an implicit reference to the Termilae and their alleged association with the origins of several of Lycia's most important settlements.²⁷

The historical authenticity of the name Termilae is made quite clear by the fact that in their own language the Lycians invariably called themselves Trēmili and their country Trēmisa. Termilae is simply a Hellenised form of Trēmili, a name which also occurs in a neo-Babylonian cuneiform inscription from Nippur (dating to c. 420 B.C.)

25. Ὀγγύλην in line 2 should probably be interpreted as 'the daughter of Ogygos' (see Kalinka, 1920 (TAM. II/1), 97), and according to Steph. Byz., Ogygos was the son of Termera (s.v. Ὀγγύλη), a name again suggestive of the Termilae.
26. Cf. TAM II 174A. 16-B.2: γενεα[λογίαν τὴν Τρεμίλ]ου καὶ Πραξιόδωκου, ἐξ ᾧ[ν] Τλῶ[ο]ς καὶ [Κ]ράγος καὶ Πίναρος ἀνήκον.
27. The town of Kragos, attested by Strabo in the Kragos mountain district (14. 3. 5), has not yet been identified. This led to the improbable view held by Spratt and Forbes (1847, 300) and Benndorf and Niemann (1884, 60) that Kragos may have been the same place as Sidyma. Kalinka argued strongly against the identification, preferring to leave the town Kragos as an as yet unidentified city in the Kragos range (TAM II/1, p. 62). Troxell has recently argued that Strabo's reference to a town called Kragos must be an error, since we know from numismatic evidence that Kragos, like Massikytos, was the name of a monetary district (1982, 112). But this does not exclude the possibility that the name Kragos was used both of a town and of the district in which it was situated, precisely as Strabo says. I prefer to leave this possibility open.

in the form ^{lu}ta-ar-mi-la-a-a.²⁸ We might further note that the workmen referred to in the Persepolis fortification tablets as *Turmir/la*, *Turmir/liya* are probably also to be identified as Lycians.²⁹

But in spite of the wide range of references to Trēmili/Termilae, the Greeks invariably referred to the Lycians as *Lykioi*, obviously on the assumption that the word Lycia is itself Greek in origin. This is made clear by the various attempts in the Greek sources to explain how the designation *Lycian* arose. According to Herodotos (1.173, 7.92), the name was due to the Athenian refugee Lykos, son of Pandion;³⁰ but according to a tradition recorded by Antoninus Liberalis (*met.* 35.3) the country's name was changed to Lycia by Leto, in honour of the wolves (λύκοι) who had guided her to the river Xanthos.³¹ In yet another version appearing in Alexander Polyhistor, (ap. Steph. Byz. s.v. Τρεμίλη) it was the Greek Bellerophon who changed the name of the people – from Tremili to Lykioi.

In each case the explanation of the name-change is clearly based on the assumption that the name Lycia is Greek in origin; and coupled with this is the more general assumption that the name-change reflects the presence or the arrival of Greek elements in Lycia in the early stages of its development. Both these assumptions will be discussed in some detail in Part B of this chapter.

Part B Some Historical Observations and Conclusions

We began this chapter by noting the role which the Lycians play in the *Iliad* as the most important of Troy's allies in the war against the Greeks. The very presence of Lycians at Troy is in itself a matter for comment, in view of Lycia's remoteness from the field of action; and for this reason the prominence of their role is all the more noteworthy,

28. See Eilers, 1940, 208-10, Houwink ten Cate, 1965, 4, Laroche, 1976, 19.
29. See Hallock, 1969, 29, and Schmitt, 1982b, 373.
30. Cf. Diodoros 5. 56. 1, Pomponius Mela, chor. 1. 14. 79, Strabo 12. 8. 5, 14. 3. 10, Pausanias 1. 19. 3.
31. For a discussion of Leto's arrival in Lycia, see Bryce, 1983b.

especially when we take into consideration the extent to which civilisation had developed in Lycia up to and including the period of the *Iliad's* composition.

As we noted in Chapter 1, there is as yet no firm evidence for settlement in the country prior to the end of the 8th century, the earliest attested date for the city of Xanthos which is so far the oldest known site in Lycia. Even so, we can hardly doubt that the Lycian civilisation had been established in the country some time before this. There is certainly nothing in the *Iliad* to suggest that the Lycians were recent arrivals in their country; and the Homeric assumption that the kingdom of Sarpedon and Glaukos already existed at the time of the Trojan War must in itself indicate settlement in Lycia several generations at the very least, before the end of the 8th century - i.e. before living memory at the time of the *Iliad's* composition.

As we have observed, Homer clearly regarded the Lycian participants in the Trojan War as inhabitants of the Xanthos valley. Consequently, if there is any material evidence that can be adduced in support of the Homeric tradition, it is in this region in particular that we might expect to find it. There is of course the city of Xanthos, which may have existed at the time the *Iliad* was composed. However, at present we have no evidence that its foundation dates back to a more remote period, and clearly in its earliest known archaeological phase it was a small community with at best limited outside contacts.³² Notwithstanding this, it probably represents the most advanced stage in the material development of the Lycian civilisation up to the end of the 8th century. And the fact that it is the only site in Lycia which has so far provided evidence of its existence in the late 8th century very likely indicates that in this period the region as a whole was sparsely inhabited by a people or by peoples whose civilisation was much more rudimentary

32. See Metzger and Coupel, 1963, 77, Demargne and Metzger, 1967, 1381-82, Metzger, 1972, 21-26. It seems likely that this settlement was surrounded by a wall, but all trace of it has now disappeared and the only buildings that can be dated to this period are found in the south-east part of the acropolis in a projection of the Classical wall (Demargne and Metzger, 1967, 1382, 21-28).

than is indicated in the Homeric references to Lycia. It may be that much of the population of Lycia up to this time lived a semi-nomadic existence, or were settled in small villages of which no traces have yet been found. If in fact Lycia was inhabited during the Bronze Age, this was probably the nature of Bronze Age settlement in the country as well (as suggested in Chapter 1).

It is extremely difficult, then, to reconcile our current picture of Lycia during, or at any time up to, the 8th century, with the Homeric picture of a flourishing kingdom whose forces play so prominent a role in a Bronze Age conflict far to the north. And this must in turn raise grave doubts as to whether the tradition of Lycian participation in the Trojan War originated in, or was directly associated with, Lycia itself.

How, then, do we account for the tradition?

The line recently adopted by Frei is that Sarpedon's role in the conflict (and consequently the role of the Lycian contingent) is purely a Homeric invention; the Lycian hero was introduced into the conflict in order to provide a worthy opponent for Patroklos, and his death at Patroklos' hands marks the climax of the Greek's career before he himself is killed by Hektor. Frei further suggests that Homer's knowledge of the Lycians may have been based on an epic on Lycia composed by a Greek poet for a Lycian prince, perhaps the ruler of Xanthos, some time before the end of the 8th century; perhaps this epic highlighted conflicts between Lycians and Rhodians, as reflected in the duel between Sarpedon and the Rhodian Tlepolemos which Homer transferred to the context of the Trojan War (Frei, 1978).

Frei's hypothesis rests on the basic assumption that the tradition of Lycian participation in the war originated in a 1st millennium setting, and would therefore have to be explained as a literary invention. But an alternative possibility is that the tradition did not begin with the 1st millennium Lycians, but was inherited by them from their Bronze Age ancestors. In this possibility we can find a much more plausible explanation, I believe, for alleged Lycian involvement in the Trojan War. I suggest that the Homeric tradition arose out of events originally associated with a different area of Anatolia, and was subsequently brought to Lycia some time after the end of the Bronze Age.

As we noted in Chapter 1, the Lycians were a Luwian-speaking

people whose origins are, in part at least, to be sought among the Late Bronze Age population groups of Anatolia. And in particular we have noted the likelihood that the Lycians were most closely linked with the Bronze Age Lukka people of western Caria, from communities around the territory of Millawanda/Miletos. Could the Homeric tradition of Lycian participation in the Trojan War have originated with the Lukka people?

It is interesting to note that the names of several 1st millennium Lycian cities have close counterparts among the Late Bronze Age place-names of western Anatolia. The most notable of these are Lycian Arinna (= Xanthos) and Tlawa (= Tlos), corresponding to the Bronze Age names Arinna and Dalawa. Settlements bearing these names were situated in or near the Carian group of Lukka communities (see Bryce, 1974, 399-401). Do these equivalents provide us with a direct link between Lukka and Lycia? Here some caution is necessary. We can hardly entertain the possibility, as Goetze (1968, 153-54) and Garstang and Gurney (1959, 80 and 82) once did, that Bronze Age Arinna and Lycian Arinna/Xanthos (for example) were one and the same, in the absence of any evidence to indicate that the Lycian city was a Bronze Age foundation. On the other hand, it is not inconceivable that Arinna/Xanthos was founded some time after the end of the Bronze Age by Lukka immigrants, or their descendants, who retained the name of the Bronze age community from which they or their forerunners came. In like manner Tlawa/Tlos may have been founded by Lukka immigrants. As we noted above, one of the settlements which bore this name in the Late Bronze Age was situated in the general area of the western Lukka communities.

Further to our observation that the Lycian kingdom of Sarpedon and Glaukos seems to have been confined to the Xanthos valley, it is noteworthy that two of the most prominent names in Homer's account of the Lycians - Bellerophon and Sarpedon - were closely associated, in later times at least, with the Xanthos valley cities Xanthos and Tlos. Their names figure amongst the five deme-names known from Tlos,³³

33. *Bellerophonteios*-TAM II 548. 11 and 36, 590. 4; *Sarpedonios* - TAM II 597a. 2. The deme-names may of course have been due to literary tradition. But the literary tradition itself may reflect a longstanding belief that Bellerophon and Sarpedon had a special attachment to these cities.

and Bellerophon seems to have enjoyed special prominence in the city both as a cult figure and in sculptural representations.³⁴ Sarpedon was held in high esteem at Xanthos, with which he appears to have had special links. His heroön at Xanthos is mentioned by several ancient authors,³⁵ a city deme was named after him, as at Tlos,³⁶ and he figures in the Xanthos stele inscription (TL 44 b 46).³⁷ We might also note, in an admittedly late source, the tradition that Skylakeus, companion of Glaukos, was a native of Tlos. According to Quintus of Smyrna (10. 158-63), when Skylakeus returned from the Trojan War and reported on the death of all his fellow citizens, the women of the city stoned him to death near Bellerophon's tomb - presumably because he had not died alongside his comrades.

These associations may of course have arisen directly out of the literary traditions. But even if they did originate in this way, they clearly support the view that the early legends which deal with Lycia were most closely connected with the Xanthos valley.

If we put all the above considerations together - (a) the likely ethnic links between Lukka and Lycia, (b) the likely place-name links between Arinna and Dalawa on the one hand and the Xanthos valley cities Xanthos and Tlos on the other, (c) the archaeological evidence which indicates the earliest known Lycian settlement in the Xanthos valley, (d) the close association between the Xanthos valley and the earliest literary traditions relating to Lycia, (e) the specific associations between the Homeric heroes of Lycia and the cities of Xanthos and Tlos - we have reasonable grounds for suggesting that the Lycian tradition in the *Iliad* was due initially to Lukka settlers who some time after the end of the Bronze Age brought with them to Lycia, to the Xanthos valley in particular, the traditions and folk heroes of their original homeland in

34. To be discussed by Zahle in vol. II.

35. E.g. Appian, *bell. civ.* 4.78-79. For other references, see Zwicker, 1923, 41. 1-18.

36. Referred to in TAM II 264.2 and 265.1. Sarpedon also appears as a personal name, both at Xanthos (e.g. TAM II 359.2) and at Tlos (e.g. TAM II 639.5).

37. The Lycian form of the name is Zrppudeine. Tritsch has also suggested to me that the seated male figure on the north side of the Harpy tomb at Xanthos is intended to represent Sarpedon.

western Caria. Yet Homer located the kingdom of Sarpedon not in Bronze Age Lukka, but in the area with which the traditions concerning Sarpedon were most closely associated in the 8th century. By this time, presumably, the original homeland of the Lukka immigrants into Lycia had been largely, if not entirely, forgotten.

If this proposal is correct, what route or routes did the Lukka people take in their migration into the Xanthos valley? Some of them may have travelled overland, although the mountain barriers which largely isolate Lycia from the interior no doubt exercised some limitations on land-travel into the country. On the other hand, Lukka seafaring activities in the eastern Mediterranean may well have paved the way for Lukka immigrants to enter Lycia via a seaward route, making a landfall at the mouth of the Xanthos river near the site of Patara, and then moving up the Xanthos valley.³⁸ I shall have more to say about this towards the end of the chapter.

Now if I am right in maintaining that Lukka immigrants formed one of the basic elements of the population of 1st millennium Lycia and that the immigrants brought with them and preserved some of the traditions of their Late Bronze Age homeland, can we go further and maintain that it was one of these traditions that provided the basis for the Homeric account of Lycian participation in the Trojan War? Do we have any independent evidence to suggest a Bronze Age Lukka setting for Homer's Lycians?

We do know from the Hittite texts that the Lukka people were involved in a series of conflicts in western Anatolia during the Late Bronze Age, and it may be that one of these conflicts formed the kernel of the Lycian tradition in the *Iliad*. Scholars have sometimes drawn attention to the Hittite text dealing with the Assuwan Confederacy, the league of 22 countries in conflict with the Hittites around the middle of the 15th century B.C. (referred to above in Chapter 1). The list of states

38. Seafarers travelling from the north and seeking to make a landfall on the Lycian coast might have chosen either Telmessos or Patara, but probably no point in between, in view of the completely forbidding nature of the Lycian coast between Telmessos and Patara.

belonging to the Confederacy begins (probably) with Lukka³⁹ and ends with Taruisa which some scholars suggest may be the Hittite form of the Greek name Τροία (Troy) (see, e.g., Garstang and Gurney, 1959, 105-06). If the Taruisa-Troia equation is valid, then the Assuwan Confederacy indicates that on at least one occasion Lukka and Troy were co-members of a western Anatolian military alliance. But it is dangerous to go beyond this point. Although Albright claimed that there is a striking correspondence in make-up and geographical extension between the Trojan Catalogue and the Assuwan Confederacy (1950, 169), the degree of correspondence between the actual place names, in the two lists Homeric and Hittite, is in fact very slight; and in any case the league of Assuwan states was involved in a conflict with Hittites, not with Greeks, and dates to a period 250 years or more before the period when according to Greek tradition the Trojan War took place.⁴⁰

What is significant for our present discussion is that military alliances of the type represented in the *Iliad*, alliances which may have included both Lukka and Troy, did take place amongst the western Anatolian states during the Late Bronze Age. And it may well be that Lukka participation in such an alliance provided the origin, or one of the origins, of the Lycian tradition in the *Iliad*.

* * *

I have suggested that population groups from the Lukka communities near Millawanda/Miletos may have resettled in Lycia, especially in the Xanthos valley, some time after the end of the Late Bronze Age. But we then have to account for the fact that in their own language the Lycians invariably referred to themselves not as Lukka people, but as Trĩmĩli - the name which the Greeks represented as Termilae, or occasionally Tremili. Is it possible to connect this name with the Late Bronze Age Lukka people?

39. On the reading of the name Lukka in this text, see (most recently) Bryce, 1979b, 3, n. 9.

40. On the basis of the revised dating of the text in question, referred to above in Chapter 1, n. 9.

The French scholar Laroche has argued that *Trēmili*/*Termilae* is derived from the Luwian word *tarmi-* which is used to designate a pointed object ('clou, cheville') (1976, 19). From *tarmi-*, Laroche suggests, one can construct a Luwian adjective **tarmašši-*, which presumably leads to *Trēmīs-* (ethnic *Trēmili*), the Lycian name for Lycia. In Laroche's view, *tarmi-* can perhaps be applied to a mountain peak, so that it would be an appropriate designation for a people occupying the mountainous regions of south-west Asia Minor, in particular mountain-top cities such as the Lycian and Pisidian Termessos;⁴¹ the name may well have been adopted by newcomers to Lycia after their separation from a parent group of Luwian-speaking peoples – perhaps the Lukka people of the Hittite texts.

Laroche's theory has recently been disputed, on linguistic grounds, by Bichner, who argues that Luwian **tarmašši-* would lead not to *Trēmīs-* but to something like **Trēmehi* in Lycian (1983, 66). As an alternative proposal, Bichner suggests that *Trēmīs-* may be connected with the Late Bronze Age place-name *Attarimma*, which as we have noted in Chapter 1 belongs to the Lukka group of communities of western Anatolia. This suggestion, already made some years ago by Carruba (1964/65, 286-89) (as Bichner acknowledges), seems feasible from a linguistic point of view, and would of course provide further support for the proposition of close ethnic links between Bronze Age Lukka and 1st millennium Lycia. Yet the evidence for the linguistic equation is far from conclusive, and we must of course bear in mind that our Greek literary sources maintain, with a high degree of consistency, that the Termilae were not a local Anatolian group but migrants from Crete.

As we have noted, this migration tradition is also associated in several of our literary sources with the foundation of Miletos. And if the traditions which associate Crete with the western and south-western coastal areas of Asia Minor do in fact have some historical basis, they can conceivably be seen as a reflection of Minoan trading or colonising activities in the area extending back as early as the Middle Minoan

41. The Lycian Termessos, commonly called Termessos Minor, was, however, a Hellenistic foundation; see Coulton, 1982, 129.

period (MM. IIIB, c. 1600 B.C.), the period when, it has been claimed, Miletos was settled by Minoan immigrants (see Weickert, 1959, 192-93 and 1959/60, 2). And it is quite conceivable that the traditions of a Minoan immigrant to Miletos passed into local Anatolian folk lore and subsequently came to Lycia via the Lukka people.

Yet we should not altogether overlook the possibility that the Termilae tradition may reflect an early population-component in Lycia with more direct Cretan affiliations. The sheer persistence of the Cretan-Lycian association in a variety of literary sources which are spread over many centuries and are obviously not dependent on a single source must in itself furnish a reasonably strong presumption that the association is not without some historical foundation. It may be that the Termilae do in fact represent a group of Cretan immigrants who in the first instance settled in the south-west corner of Caria in the Halikarnassos peninsula. In this area we have evidence of a number of settlements whose names suggest an association with the Termilae – namely Carian Telmessos, Termera, Termerion, Termeros, and Termilae.⁴² According to Strabo, (7.7.1, 13.1.59) these settlements were associated with the Leleges who were driven from their homeland in north-west Asia Minor following the destruction of Troy. Some of them apparently resettled on the Aegean coast, south of the Carian settlements in Ephesos, Miletos etc., until they were again displaced by the Ionian migrations and finally occupied the peninsula between Myndos and Halikarnassos (Strabo 14.1.3, 14.2.18).

It is obviously dangerous to place too much weight on such specific details in a purportedly early tradition, especially in the case of the Leleges, who from the historian's viewpoint are little more than a semi-legendary people whose origins and ethnic relationships are for the most part obscure. Nevertheless the pattern of displacement, resettlement, and further displacement seems to have been a marked characteristic of many Anatolian peoples following the collapse of the Hittite New Kingdom, and the Ionian occupation of the central Aegean coast at the end of the 2nd millennium no doubt resulted in further population

42. See the individual entries in RE V A.

movements and resettlements, as Strabo's account suggests. The Termilae may have come under pressure from new population groups displaced by the Ionians, and this may have led to an eastward drift by the Termilae, terminating in their eventual resettlement in Lycia, while their original link with the south-west corner of Caria was perpetuated by the retention of a number of the original place names in this area.

At some presumably early stage in the development of the Lycian civilisation, the name Termilae was adopted, within Lycia itself, as a general designation for the country's inhabitants. This is clearly reflected in the epichoric inscriptions, in which the Lycians are invariably called *Trēmili*. Unfortunately, we are unable to determine how or why this name first came to be used. We can simply note that if it did represent one of the early population groups which occupied Lycia, the group must have exercised a strong cultural or political influence in the country, which led to the eventual adoption of its name as a general designation for the country's inhabitants as a whole.

Yet the Greeks called the *Trēmili* *Lykioi*; hence the name *Lycian* which we use today. The name is almost certainly a relic of the Late Bronze Age name Lukka, which by some unknown means found its way into Greek tradition and was unwittingly preserved by the Greeks on the assumption that it was Greek in origin. Hence the various attempts to explain the name in Hellenocentric terms, as we noted in Part A of this chapter. If this explanation is correct, then the Greek term *Lykioi* very likely reflects an important early component of the Lycian population, perhaps originally distinct from but eventually amalgamating with the Termilae (cf Tritsch, 1950, 501). And the designation may well have persisted in the Greek language and in Greek literature on the assumption of direct ethnic or familial links between Lycians and Greeks.⁴³

43. There are a number of parallel instances of foreigners calling a country and its inhabitants by a name different to that used by the inhabitants themselves. In such instances, the different names were often originally associated with particular groups within the country, or within the civilisation as a whole. We might, for example, compare the Latin term *Graeci* to designate the Hellenes, the former designation probably arising from Roman contact with the Graii in southern Italy, and subsequently being applied by the Romans to the Greeks as a whole.

We have seen this assumption expressed in the Bellerophon tradition, in which Sarpedon and Glaukos are given an Argive ancestry, and the Lycian and Argive kings are related by marriage. How feasible is the Lycian-Argive connection? Is it possible that the tradition does reflect actual contacts, whether political, commercial, or familial, between Lycia and the Argolid district of Greece in Homeric or pre-Homeric times? The proposition is an extremely doubtful one, even if we believe that in this period Lycia had a more advanced material civilization than the evidence at present indicates. We certainly have no evidence that it had any form of contact with the Greek mainland up to this time.

But if we shift Homer's 'Lycians' back to their likely 2nd millennium location in the region around Miletos, we are dealing with an area which may well have had contacts, both commercial and cultural, with Late Helladic settlements in Greece from c. 1400 B.C. onwards (see, e.g., Kleiner, 1969). It may be that the very beginning of the tradition of Bellerophon's journey from Argos to Asia Minor arose out of such contacts, and it is not inconceivable that an Argive immigrant to Asia Minor achieved the status of a legendary hero for exploits he had performed on behalf of the local people. It is certainly much more likely that the Bellerophon tradition originated in a Mycenaean setting rather than in a late 2nd or early 1st millennium setting, as Peppermüller has convincingly argued (1962). And if the tradition does in fact belong to the Late Bronze Age and reflects Mycenaean contacts with Asia Minor, then its association with the 1st millennium Lycians can only have been a secondary one. Its initial association must have been with Late Bronze Age 'Lycians' – people of the Lukka communities situated in the region of Miletos, where there is clear evidence of contact with the Late Helladic civilisation of Greece. Indeed, one of Bellerophon's exploits, his conflict with the Amazons, would seem far more appropriate in a western Carian than in a Lycian setting. The Lukka people were frequently involved in conflicts in western Anatolia, and their suggested location in Caria would at least put them in close proximity to the area where the Amazons are most commonly located in the Greco-Roman literary sources (whatever the origin of the Amazon tradition may have been).

When the Lukka people moved into Lycia, it is reasonable to suppose

that they took with them a number of the traditions of their original homeland, including memories of the military exploits of their ancestors, and perhaps also of the exploits of an adopted hero from Greece. In Lycia these traditions acquired a local setting and were perhaps developed and expanded in a way that reflected the obstacles and conflicts which the newcomers encountered on their arrival.

The tradition of Bellerophon's conflict with the Solymians seems clearly to belong to a Lycian setting, and may well reflect conflicts, perhaps territorial disputes, in which later immigrants to the area became involved with a population group already settled there. As we have seen, the Solymians are attested in several of our sources as early inhabitants of Lycia, and it may be that as a result of new population pressures they were eventually forced to retreat into Pisidia or the mountains of eastern Lycia where they allegedly dwelt in later times.

At all events, the apparent successes of the newcomers to Lycia in overcoming the obstacles they encountered in settling their new homeland may well have been added to the achievements of a traditional folk hero from their original homeland; we have already noted the practice of associating significant achievements or victories in a country's legendary or semi-legendary past with such a person, as in the case of the various exploits associated with Sarpedon in Lycia and Theseus in Attica. The literary sources represent Bellerophon as a newcomer to Lycia, originally in conflict with the people already settled there, but eventually making his peace with them and being allocated half their territory as his kingdom. It is conceivable that this reflects, in some respects at least, the sequence of events resulting in Lukka settlement in Lycia.

In Greek hands the traditions of the early Lycians were given sequence, structure, and coherence, from which emerged the Bellerophon myth, a myth which cast its hero (who was allegedly Greek in origin) in the role of a monster-slayer riding a winged horse. The concept of both monster-slayer and winged horse was almost certainly adopted by the Greeks from the Near East, and was represented with particular appropriateness in the myth of a hero whose exploits took place in a Near Eastern setting. But the myth in its developed form was probably based on traditions from the original Bronze Age homeland of the Lukka

people as well as on later traditions associated with Lukka settlement in Lycia. The Argive origin of the hero of the myth is an element which very likely belongs to the earlier period, so that we should think of the hero's 'migration' to Lycia essentially as a secondary migration after his earlier domicile in western Caria. However Greek tradition brought Bellerophon directly to Lycia from Greece, through ignorance of any intermediate phase.

The suggestion that the Bellerophon tradition, or at least elements of it, originated in a Late Bronze Age Lukka setting may tie in to some extent with the tradition which credits the building of the walls of Tiryns to giants from Lycia (See *Apollodoros*, *bib.* 2.2.1; cf. *Strabo* 8.6.11). As Dunbabin has pointed out, this tradition provides another argument for setting Bellerophon among the Mycenaean survivals in Greek mythology, for Tiryns was 'a place of no importance in the history of the Argolid after Mycenaean times' (1953, 1177). And if we think again of our Carian location for the forerunners of the 1st millennium Lycians, then the tradition appears even more credible. If we accept that there were close contacts between the central Aegean coast of Asia Minor and Mycenaean settlements in mainland Greece, it is not impossible that Anatolian craftsmen, perhaps even Lukka men, were employed on building projects on the Greek mainland. It has in fact been proposed that the models for the fortress towns and citadels of the Argolid are to be found in Asia Minor. Tritsch refers to the rapid development and renewal of fortification techniques at Tiryns and Mycenae during the 14th and 13th centuries. All the innovations, he claims, can be traced to Anatolia, and the link in the 13th century was Miletos (1968, 131).

* * *

It remains for us to consider whether the Homeric Pandaros has a legitimate place in the traditions relating to early Lycia. Unless we assume that his original association with Lycia was simply a Homeric invention, or a Homeric misconception, the references to him in Book 5 of the *Iliad* seem to indicate that he was already regarded as one of the legendary heroes or cult figures of Lycia at the time of the *Iliad's*

composition. Presumably Homer attempted to take account of this as well as of his traditional connection with the Troad.

Now if there was an association between Pandaros and Troy in pre-Homeric tradition, and an association between Pandaros and Lycia in the 8th century, this may well have led to a type of literary synthesis in the *Iliad* which resulted in the portrayal of Pandaros as a participant from Lycia in the Trojan War. Yet if such a synthesis has taken place it is obviously incomplete, since Homer has apparently failed to recognise the inconsistency between Pandaros' Lycian associations and his role as a commander of a Trojan contingent.

The inconsistency may, however, be instructive. I have suggested above that the traditions associated with other Lycian legendary heroes did not originate in Lycia but were brought into the country by immigrants some time after the end of the Bronze Age. It may well be that the same process occurred with Pandaros. His role in the *Iliad*, which associates him directly with the Troad as well as with Lycia, may reflect population links between the two areas. And it is conceivable that such links resulted from the southward movement of a group of northerners from the Troad who eventually resettled in Lycia in the late 2nd or early 1st millennium.⁴⁴

I have also referred to the tradition of the pirate commander Chimarrhos, whose fleet allegedly came from a 'Lycian colony' in the vicinity of Zeleia in the Troad and terrorised the coastal areas of Lycia. This tradition provides us with another link, apparently quite independent of the Pandaros tradition, between the Troad and Lycia, and perhaps also with an indication of the means used by a group, or by groups, of marauding northerners in entering and settling in Lycia. Admittedly there is only one late attestation of the tradition, since Plutarch is the only writer who records it. Nevertheless the fact that both this and the Pandaros tradition indirectly link Lycia with Zeleia may be a matter of some significance.

Is there a possibility that these Lycian traditions are in some way

44. For a more detailed discussion of Pandaros' role in the *Iliad* and the possible conclusions to be drawn from it, see Bryce, 1977.

related to the movements of the so-called Sea Peoples (referred to in Chapter 1) who figure in the records of the Egyptian kings Merneptah (c. 1213-1204 B.C.) and Ramesses III (c. 1185-1154 B.C.)? While this is not the place to discuss in detail the composition or origins of the Sea Peoples, it is not unlikely that they were made up largely of population groups from Anatolia and other parts of the Near Eastern world who were displaced from their original homelands in the upheavals which occurred at the end of the Bronze Age and sought new homes elsewhere. They were not, I believe, the primary cause of these upheavals. Rather they followed in the wake of the gradual disintegration of the Late Bronze Age Near Eastern kingdoms. They were in part the victims of this disintegration, and in the widespread unsettled conditions which followed they may well have taken on a marauding aspect in their search for new lands.

I have referred in Chapter 1 to the piratical activities of Lukka people in the eastern Mediterranean in the 14th century B.C., and we know that Lukka people were involved in at least the early activities of the Sea Peoples during the reign of Merneptah.⁴⁵ We may not be able to go as far as placing early settlement in Lycia specifically within a Sea Peoples context. But it would not be unreasonable to suggest that this settlement was generated by the same sets of circumstances which gave rise to the Sea Peoples' movements in their attempts to find new lands to settle. The Chimarrhos tradition fits very appropriately into the general scene of marauding northerners who moved southwards by sea (as well as by land) and attacked the coastlands of the eastern Mediterranean as a prelude to settlement in these areas. And in this connection we should note the literary tradition that Xanthos and Patara, perhaps two of the oldest established settlements in Lycia, were founded by pirates (*Eustathius, Dion. Perieg.* 129).

* * *

45. For a recent discussion of the participants in the attack on Egypt during Merneptah's reign, see Sanders, 1978, 105-15; on the Lukka people in particular, see 105-07.

The first Greek state to have any significant contact with Lycia in the 1st millennium was undoubtedly Rhodes. And it is just conceivable that Sarpedon's contest with the Rhodian Tlepolemos in the *Iliad* reflects conflicts which actually took place between Lycians and Rhodians in an early 1st millennium context, as several scholars have already suggested.⁴⁶ Whether or not this is so, we do know that the Rhodians had established one or more settlements in what later became eastern Lycia (i.e. from the Arykandos river eastwards) dating back, in one case at least, to the early 7th century.⁴⁷ And they may well have

46. See Homer, *Il.* 628-98. The suggestion was first made by Treuber, 1887, 89-90. Cf. Demargne and Metzger, 1967, 1381. 26-30 and Frei, 1978, 823-24. Note also the claim made by the scholiast ad *Il.* 5.639 $\varphi\alpha\sigma\iota\delta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\lambda\Lambda\upsilon\kappa\iota\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \text{'}\rho\omicron\delta\omicron\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \epsilon\chi\theta\rho\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\iota\upsilon$. Nilsson, however, argued that the episode could just as easily be referred to Mycenaean times, on the (very dubious) grounds that in this period the Greeks made repeated attacks on the south coast of Asia Minor (1933, 262); cf. Page, 1959, 147-49. Childs points out (in an unpublished manuscript) that proof of at least later hostilities between Rhodes and Lycia is to be found in the so-called Lindian Chronicle or Anagraphe where 'is listed a dedication resulting from a campaign of Kleoboulos of Lindos against the Lycians' (see Blinkenberg, 1915/1941, 169-70, C XXIII, Jac. FGH F 532). Kleoboulos' career is probably to be assigned to the first half of the 6th century B.C.

47. I.e. Phaselis (founded 691 B.C.), almost certainly a Rhodian foundation. The literary sources are in agreement in attributing to the city a Greek origin (e.g. Cicero, *Verr.* 4. 10. 21, Plutarch, *Kim.* 12.3), more precisely a Dorian origin, according to Herodotos (2.178). But the traditions differ as to whether the founder of the city came from Argos or Rhodes. According to the one tradition, its founder Lakios came from Argos at the instigation of Mopsos, and bought the territory on which the city was founded from a shepherd Kylabras for some salt fish (Philostephanos ap. Athenaeus, *deip.* VII 297F). In another account, Mopsos himself was the founder of Phaselis (Pomp. Mela, *chor.* 1.14.79). (For a discussion of the association of Mopsos with southern Asia Minor, see Houwink ten Cate, 1965, 44-50). Philostephanos also refers to the tradition that Lakios came originally from Lindos in Rhodes and was the brother of Antiphemos who founded Gela in Sicily; see also Steph. Byz. s.v. Γέλα and Etym. Magn. 225 s.v. Γέλα. There can be little doubt that the Rhodian tradition is the more authentic one, in view of the mention of Lakios in the

founded other settlements elsewhere on the Lycian coast.

This is perhaps indicated by the tradition of the Telchines recorded in Diodoros Sikulos (5. 55-56). According to this tradition, the Telchines were inhabitants of Rhodes who dispersed when they received news that a great flood was coming to overwhelm their land. A number of them under the leadership of Lykos went to Lycia where they dedicated beside the Xanthos river a temple to Apollo. It is possible that we have in this tradition a reference to the Letoon, the sanctuary of Leto which lies on the west bank of the Xanthos river several kilometres south of the city of Xanthos; but it is far more likely that the allusion is to Apollo's sanctuary at Patara, which lies on the sea near the mouth of the river (see Metzger, 1966, 101). From Herodotos (2.182) we know that an oracle was functioning there at least by the 5th century B.C. It may in fact have been established a good deal earlier than this, but at present we have no evidence to indicate when it first came into operation, or whether or not its foundation was due to Greek influence. This will be further discussed in Chapter 6.

At all events, the Xanthos valley was almost certainly the area where the most important developments in the formative stages of the Lycian civilisation took place. Xanthos and perhaps also Tlos were focal points of the early civilisation, and Xanthos itself was probably the origin of a number of other settlements in or near the Xanthos valley. According to the 4th century B.C. writer Menekrates of Xanthos (ap. Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀρτύμνησος) Pinara, situated on the east slope of the Antikragos range, and Artymnesos, whose precise location is still

Lindian Chronicle (Blinkenberg, 1915/1941, 169-171, C XXIV). Furthermore, as Bean points out, 'the early inscriptions (of Phaselis), down to 300 B.C., are written in the special Rhodian variety of the Doric dialect' (1979b, 152); see also Blinkenberg, 1915/1941, 170. Other Rhodian settlements in what became eastern Lycia include Korydalla (Hekataios ap. Steph. Byz. s.v. Κορύδαλλα), Gagae (Etym. Magn. s.v. Γάγαι and Eusebius, *Mart. Palaestr.* 4; these authors give two different versions of the founding of Gagae by the Rhodians), and Rhodiapolis (Theopompos ap. Photius, *bib.* 176, p.120 a 14.15 - Jac. FGH IIB, 115, no. 103; and cf. Treuber, 1887, 90, n. 3).

unknown, were founded by colonists from Xanthos. And the tradition recorded by Panyasis (see p. 22) may indicate that Xanthos, Tlos, Pinara, (and Kragos? - see above, n.27) whose eponymous founders were allegedly brothers, were regarded as forming an interrelated group of Lycian settlements, perhaps with close ethnic and kinship ties.⁴⁸

These settlements may well have been early centres of the Lycian population, and the territory which they incorporated, or which lay between them, may have constituted the region politically identifiable as Lycia at least up to the time of the Persian conquest c. 540 B.C. I have suggested that in Homer's time Lycia and the Xanthos valley were essentially one and the same, and in a strict political sense Lycia may not have been much larger than this when the Persian commander Harpagos invaded the country and defeated a small Lycian army on the plain of Xanthos (to be discussed in Chapter 4).

This does not of course mean that other areas which later became part of the Lycian political organisation were uninhabited at this time. But for the most part their population was probably sparse, living in small communities, and perhaps largely semi-nomadic in character. They may have had a number of cultural and ethnic affinities with the Xanthos valley population, without being politically integrated with them.

It might be better, then, to think of a politically identifiable unit called Lycia as originally just one part of a broader region which we might think of as Lycia in a cultural sense - a region whose population had a common basic culture but no overall political coherence. Perhaps by the late 6th or early 5th century B.C. this situation was beginning to change, and eventually the whole of 'cultural' Lycia became absorbed within a single political framework. The process whereby this happened is something we shall consider in Chapter 4.

48. We might note in passing the statement made by Pausanias that Lycians were amongst the settlers who colonised the Greek state of Erythrae; the main body of settlers apparently came from Crete, but in addition to these there were Lycians, Carians, and Pamphylians, and Erythrae was inhabited by all these people (Pausanias 7. 3. 7). There seems to be no historical basis for Pausanias' claim; see Sakellariou, 1958, 209 and 220.

Summary of conclusions

From the discussion above, it is clear how large a role speculation must play in any attempts to determine the origins, the population components, and the early settlement patterns of the 1st millennium Lycians. I have suggested that the tradition of Lycian participation in the Trojan War may have arisen out of a Late Bronze Age tradition associated with the Lukka people of western Caria, a tradition which was perhaps brought to Lycia by Lukka immigrants some time after the end of the Bronze Age. But in addition to the Lukka element, there may have been several other population groups present in the country by the early 1st millennium - notably a group represented in Greek literary tradition as the Termilae, who were possibly of Cretan origin and whose name came to be used within Lycia as the designation of the Lycian people as a whole. Perhaps the Lukka settlers amalgamated with the Termilae, unless of course the Termilae were the Lukka people themselves under a newly assumed Luwian name. Perhaps also the newcomers to Lycia came into conflict with an earlier population group, the Solymians of the Greek texts, who may have been displaced to the mountains of Pisidia or (what became) eastern Lycia. There are also indications in our literary sources of Rhodian settlement on the Lycian coast from the early 7th century onwards. And the Pandaros tradition in Homer and the Chimarrhos tradition in Plutarch may indirectly indicate the presence of other early 1st millennium groups in Lycia, perhaps from the Troad, who were displaced from their original homelands at the end of the Bronze Age.

We have no clear picture of early settlement distribution in Lycia. I have suggested, however, that the earliest population centres developed in and around the Xanthos valley, and that the region which these centres encompassed probably constituted a unit politically identifiable as Lycia until at least the time of the Persian conquest. If so, we should probably regard this area as merely one part of a region through which the Lycian culture was spread. It is perhaps not until the late 6th century that we see the beginning of the process whereby the whole region was gradually incorporated into a single political organisation.

3. THE INSCRIPTIONS AND THE LYCIAN LANGUAGE

The Lycian language, which is still only partly deciphered, survives today in three main forms: (1) inscriptions on stone; (2) coin legends; (3) a small number of graffiti and inscriptions on ceramic and metal artifacts.¹ Of these, the first category is by far the most productive source of information on the Lycian language. To date there are 172 known Lycian inscriptions on stone, of which 150 are sepulchral inscriptions carved on the rock tombs and concerned primarily with instructions for burial. A selection of these inscriptions appear on pp. 73-88.

Most of the 22 non-sepulchral inscriptions are votive in character, but the group also includes one, or possibly two, decrees (TL 45, N 326), a 255-line inscription on a stele at Xanthos, which is concerned (amongst other things) with the genealogy and exploits of a prominent Lycian dynasty (TL 44), and a trilingual inscription, in Lycian, Greek, and Aramaic versions, which records the procedures to be followed in establishing and maintaining a new cult at the Letoon (N 320). A full list of the non-sepulchral inscriptions appears on pp. 90-98.

The inscriptions on stone were first discovered and copied by travellers to Lycia in the early 19th century.² These early discoveries were small in number and scattered, but they gave the first indication that the ancient Lycians spoke a language which was peculiar to their own country. In the 1840's there was a substantial increase in the number of known Lycian inscriptions, the result of discoveries by a succession of explorers and scholars, including Fellows, Spratt and Forbes, Hoskyn, Daniell, and Schönborn. These discoveries provided the basis for the first major collection of Lycian inscriptions, published by Schmidt in 1868.

During the last decades of the 19th century, new investigations were

conducted throughout Lycia by scholars of the 'Austrian school', namely Benndorf and Niemann, and Petersen and von Luschan.³ Their explorations brought to light a number of new inscriptions, of which copies and squeezes were subsequently made by Kalinka and Heberdey. The latter two scholars also undertook a revision of the texts already published by Schmidt, and finally in 1901 produced a comprehensive edition of all the known Lycian texts (a total of 150) under the title *Tituli Asiae Minoris : Tituli Lyciae lingua Lycia conscripti* (Vienna) (hereafter cited as TL). The texts published by Kalinka were revised and re-edited in 1932 by Friedrich in *Kleinasiatische Sprachdenkmäler* (Berlin, 52-88).

Since Kalinka's edition, some 30 new Lycian texts have been discovered, including inscriptions and graffiti on ceramic- and metal-ware. The most notable is the Letoon trilingual, whose Lycian version is by far the most important and informative of all the known readable texts in the epichoric language. The majority of the new inscriptions have recently been collected and edited by Neumann in *Neufunde lykischer Inschriften seit 1901* (Vienna, 1979); for convenience' sake these inscriptions are prefixed with the letter N (= *Nova inscriptio*).⁴

However, there are also a number of other epichoric inscriptions which do not appear in either Kalinka's or Neumann's collections. These inscriptions, to which we tentatively assign the designation *N Suppl.* (i.e. supplement to *Neumann's collection*) are as follows:

N Suppl. 1 (= *Letoon inv. no. 6121*): two epichoric inscriptions appearing on a statue base unearthed by the French at the Letoon in 1973. There are four inscriptions on the base, one on each of its four faces. The inscriptions on faces A and B (so called) are in Greek, those on faces C and D in Lycian. To date only the Greek inscription on face

1. A further source of information is provided by occasional glosses in Greek and Roman sources; e.g. Menekrates of Xanthos equates the Lycian place name Pinara with the Greek στερογγύλη 'round'. Steph. Byz. similarly glosses πύναρα as 'round', and πατάρα as equivalent to Greek κύστη ('box, chest'); cf. Neumann, 1961, 47, 1983, 137.
2. See J. von Hammer, *Topographische Ansichten, gesammelt auf einer Reise in die Levante*, Vienna, 1811, R. Walpole, *Travels in various countries of the East*, London, 1820.

3. See Benndorf and Niemann, 1884, and Petersen and von Luschan, 1889.

4. The system adopted by Neumann in numbering the new inscriptions is explained in the preface to his edition of the inscriptions, 1979b, 7. This system is purely a provisional one, and will obviously be superseded if and when a revised and enlarged edition of TL is eventually produced.

A has been published, and is dealt with below (pp. 95-96) under the designation *Erbbina II*. The inscriptions were carved under the direction of the early 4th century dynast Erbbina/Arbinas (discussed below), and are concerned primarily with dedications to the goddess Leto. For further information on the inscriptions, see Metzger, 1979, 24-25.

N Suppl. 2: a fragmentary epichoric inscription appearing on a stele unearthed by the French at Xanthos in 1979. The inscription has been published by Laroche, with transcription, translation, and commentary (1979b, 115-18, with Plate xv). The nature of the inscription is not altogether clear. Laroche suggests that it may be a decree honouring an individual (1979, 118), Mellink that it may be a legal text (1980, 509-10). Mellink further notes that a fragmentary Greek text appears on the reverse of the stele, indicating that the inscription is a Lycian-Greek bilingual.

N Suppl. 3 (= *Letoon inv. no.* 4615): a fragmentary inscription appearing on a votive base, referred to by Laroche, 1979b, 64.

N Suppl. 4: an inscription on a quadrangular base discovered at the Letoon in 1975. On the long side of the base there is a dedication to Gaius Caesar (in Greek), which has been inscribed over an earlier votive inscription in the epichoric language. The inscription is referred to by Metzger, AS 26, 1976, 67, and Neumann, 1979b, 53.

N Suppl. 5: an unpublished 5-line sepulchral inscription from Pinara, seen by Zahle.

N Suppl. 6: a very poorly preserved inscription noted at Sazak by Spratt and Forbes (1847, 40), and seen also by Zahle.

N Suppl. 7: a very fragmentary sepulchral inscription from Kandyba, seen by Zahle.

Admittedly the finds this century are disappointingly small in number. Yet in the years to come one can hope for further additions to the Lycian corpus, particularly in view of the modest but continual flow of new material from the Letoon.⁵

* * *

5. In addition to the Letoon trilingual (N 320), note also N 311 and N 312, and see also Neumann's remarks (and the references cited therein), 1979b, 43 and 53.

The inscriptions contain numerous personal and place-names, and our knowledge of the most important of these is supplemented by the legends appearing on the Lycian coins of the 5th and 4th centuries B.C. As a general rule, the names appear on the coins only in an abbreviated form. The personal names are those of dynasts or regional administrators who issued their own coinage, while the place-names presumably indicate the centres where the various coin-issues were minted. An authoritative, comprehensive edition of all the known Lycian coin-legends has recently been published by Mörholm and Neumann under the title *Die lykischen Münzlegenden* (Göttingen, 1978) (hereafter cited as *M*). A full discussion of the Lycian coinage will be given in vol. II.

Lycian graffiti and inscriptions on ceramic- and metal-ware make a small but nonetheless interesting contribution to the Lycian corpus. Most examples have come to light this century and have been included by Neumann in his edition of the post-TL inscriptions (*N* 300a-b, 307, 313a-m, 323). Two of the graffiti predate all other evidence for writing in Lycia; namely *N* 300a, which is dated by Neumann to the period 580-550 B.C., and *N* 300b, which is dated to the second half of the 7th century. However, the provenance of these graffiti is Rhodian, and their identification as Lycian is open to question (see Neumann, 1979b, 11). The earliest *clearly* attested evidence for the Lycian script dates to c.500 B.C., the date assigned to the fragment of an Olpe bearing the name *Pinike* in Lycian characters (*N* 313a).⁶ A number of Lycian coins bearing the legend KVB are probably to be dated before this - perhaps as early as 520 B.C. - but the script used on these coins is Greek, and it is probably not until c. 485 B.C. that the first coin legends in the Lycian script make their appearance (to be discussed in vol. II).

But what of the most substantial body of written material in the Lycian language - the inscriptions on stone? To what period do these belong? Several of the inscriptions provide a partial answer to this question since they can be roughly dated on the basis of politically prominent persons who are named in them. In particular, we might note the following:

6. See Metzger, 1972, 164, no. 375, and Neumann, 1979b, 30.

- (1) *TL* 77 and *N* 310 refer to Harpagos,⁷ almost certainly the father of Kheriga and Kherēi who were members of the ruling dynasty at Xanthos (to be discussed in vol.II). Since Kheriga appears to have succeeded his grandfather Kuprlli at Xanthos c. 440 B.C.,⁸ the inscriptions mentioning his father might have been carved as early as the middle of the 5th century. But as we shall see, this would make them very much earlier than any of the inscriptions which can be more precisely dated. In view of this, they should probably be assigned a rather later date in the 5th century.
- (2) *TL* 43 refers to Kheriga, whose career seems to have extended from c. 440 B.C. until the late 5th century. This provides very broad time limits for *TL* 43, but the sculptural features of the tomb on which the inscription was carved indicate a date towards the end of the 5th century, i.e. late in Kheriga's career (see Zahle, 1979, 287-88, 314).
- (3) *TL* 44, the Xanthos stele inscription, deals with historical events of the last three decades of the 5th century. On this basis, its composition can be dated to the very end of the 5th or the early 4th century.⁹
- (4) *N* Suppl.1, the two (unpublished) Lycian inscriptions appearing on the base of the statue set up by Erbbina in the Letoon. The inscriptions thus belong to the period of Erbbina's prominence in Lycian affairs - i.e. the first two or three decades of the 4th century (see below, pp. 110-11).
- (5) Six sepulchral inscriptions - *TL* 67, 83, 103, 132, 133, and *N* 314 - record the fact that they were carved in the time of the Lycian

7. The name Harpagos in its Lycian form Arppakhu appears in the ēnē...khñtawata formula, on which see below, pp. 133-34.

8. On the dating of Kuprlli's career to the period 485-40 B.C., see Mörkholm, 1972, 74-77, and on the possible overlap between Kuprlli and Kheriga, see Mörkholm, 1976, 59. On the genealogy of the Kuprllid dynasty in general, see Bryce, 1982a, 329-37.

9. On the dating of the stele, see Houwink ten Cate, 1965, 5, n. 9 (with the references cited therein), and most recently Childs, 1981, 63, n. 40 (with the references cited therein). On the stele inscription in general see Hansen, 1983, 96-97, no.177.

- Perikle, whose career is roughly datable to the period 380-60.¹⁰
- (6) *TL* 125 contains the name Khñtabura. If this is the same Khñtabura who is mentioned in *TL* 103 (referred to in (5) above), then *TL* 125 belongs to the same period as the Perikle inscriptions.
- (7) Two sepulchral inscriptions, *TL* 128 and 135, make reference to a Trbbēnimi, who is almost certainly to be identified with the person who issued coins at Limyra during the first half of the 4th century, perhaps in partnership with or as the subordinate of Perikle. The fact that one of the tombs on which the name appears can be dated on stylistic grounds to the same period as the coin-issues seems to place the identification beyond doubt (see Childs, 1981, 65 with n. 57). On this understanding, the person in question here should be distinguished from his earlier namesake Trbbēnimi (very likely a family connection) who figures twice in the Xanthos stele inscription (*TL* 44 a 44 and b 11).
- (8) *TL* 64, a very fragmentary sepulchral inscription from Isinda, and *N* 315, a more recently discovered sepulchral inscription from Seyret, make reference to Mizrppata, who is probably to be identified with Mithrapata, another coin-issuer of central Lycia during the first half of the 4th century (to be discussed in vol. II). On the basis of both historical and numismatic considerations, both the above inscriptions belong somewhere within the period 390-60.
- (9) *TL* 61, a sepulchral inscription from Bayindir Liman carved in the time of Autophradates (Lycian form Wataprrddate), whose career as satrap of Lydia falls within the period 391-50.
- (10) *TL* 40, the inscription from the so-called Payawa sarcophagos, is also to be assigned to the same period as (9). The inscription records a presentation made by Autophradates (here identified as the Persian satrap) to Payawa, the builder of the tomb. In view of both artistic and historical considerations, the tomb was probably built, and the inscriptions carved, some time between 370 and 350 B.C. (to be discussed further in vol. II).

10. On the dating of Perikle's career, see Houwink ten Cate, 1965, 12, n. 1, and most recently Childs, 1981, 73, n.111 (with the references cited by both authors).

- (11) *TL 104* makes reference to Arttuṃpara and Perikle, and apparently to a conflict between them which led to Perikle's conquest of Telmessos. Early in the satrap rebellion Arttuṃpara apparently spent some time in Pamphylia, to judge from a coin issued by him at Side and bearing his name in Lycian characters (see Atlan, 1958). Quite possibly his departure from Lycia was caused by his defeat at Perikle's hands; and if so *TL 104* can be dated c. 370, or not much later. On the other hand, it has been argued that his conflict with Perikle may have been subsequent to his sojourn in Pamphylia; and in this event, the inscription should be dated closer to 360 B.C. (see below, pp.112-13).
- (12) *N 320*, the Letoon trilingual, was originally dated by Dupont-Sommer to 358 B.C. in view of the opening words of the Aramaic version which assign the inscription to the first regnal year of the king Artaxerxes. Dupont-Sommer assumed that the king in question was Artaxerxes III Ochus, who came to power in 358.¹¹ But this dating raises a problem, since the inscription indicates that Pixodaros was satrap of Caria at the time of composition, and on the basis of a passage in Diodoros (16.74.2) it seems clear that Pixodaros did not hold this position until 341/40. In spite of Dupont-Sommer's attempt to explain this difficulty, a date after Pixodaros' attested succession as satrap seems more feasible. This in fact was first proposed by Badian, who suggests that the Artaxerxes of the Aramaic text is Arsēs, son and successor of Artaxerxes III, who may well, like his predecessors, have adopted the regnal name on his accession.¹² Badian's proposal would have the effect of lowering the date of the trilingual to 337/36, the year

11. See Dupont-Sommer, 1974, 139-40, and 1979, 165-67. Cf. Metzger, 1979, 33-34.

12. Badian, 1977, supported by Wörle, 1978, 234, n. 174, Robert, 1977, 413, no. 472, and 1980, 458, no. 486, Hahn, 1981, 52, Hornblower, 1982, 46-49, Eichner, 1983, 52 (although Eichner has inadvertently (?) written 327 as the year of Arsēs' accession). In response, Dupont-Sommer still argues for the earlier dating (1979, espec. 166, n. 1). Note Frei's comment on this response (1981, 368-69). Frei still prefers to leave the question open.

- when Arsēs came to power, and clearly within the period when Pixodaros is attested as satrap of Caria.
- (13) *TL 29* makes reference to Arttuṃpara (line 7), Edriyeuse (line 5), and Alakhssa[n]tra (line 9). Very likely Edriyeuse is to be identified with Idrieus, second son of Hekatomnos and satrap of Caria (and Lycia) in the period 351/50 - 344/43,¹³ and Alakhssa[n]tra is almost certainly Alexander the Great, who campaigned in Lycia in 334/33 (see Arrian 1.24. 3-6). If these identifications are correct, then the reference to Idrieus must be a retrospective one, and the inscription should be dated to c. 330 B.C.
- (14) *TL 11* contains a further reference to Arttuṃpara, and is probably to be dated within the period covered by (10) and (12).
- (15) *TL 35* begins with the words ||| uhi khñtawati pttule. Laroche sees in the word *pttule* the proper name Ptole[my], taking up the idea first proposed by Heberdey and Imbert (see Imbert, 1900, 249-50), and translates the Lycian phrase as follows: "1 'An IV (du) roi Ptolé[mée]" (Laroche, 1979, 56, supported by Frei, 1981, 364). *pttule* also occurs in *TL 65* (line 8), though in a broken and obscure context. If *pttule* is in fact the Lycian equivalent of Ptole[my], then we have to reckon with the possibility that *TL 35* and *65* should be dated to the period of one of the first two Ptolemaic rulers of Egypt - Ptolemy I Soter or his son and successor Ptolemy Philadelphus - both of whom made conquests in Asia Minor early in the third century; and the latter in particular seems to have had close connections with Lycia, renaming Patara after his wife Arsinoe (*Strabo* 14.3.6). This would mean that *TL 35*, and presumably *TL 65*, are by far the latest of the datable epichoric inscriptions. But in my view the *pttule*-Ptole[my] equation is a highly conjectural one and cannot be maintained with any great degree of confidence. Furthermore, we should note that in *TL 65* the name Kheziga also appears on three occasions (lines 13, 15, 17). This name figures in the family line of the Xanthian dynasty which held authority in Lycia during the 5th and early 4th

13. On the Hekatomnid succession, see Bockish, 1969, 117-75.

centuries. If *TL 65* belongs to this context, then it can hardly be claimed that *pttule* is the Lycianised version of the name of one of the early Ptolemies.

On the basis of these observations, we can conclude that the period covered by the datable epichoric inscriptions extended from the last decades of the 5th century down to the last decades of the 4th century - i.e., on a conservative estimate, for a period of about a century: Does this mean that the recording of burial instructions, dedications, decrees etc. was limited to this period? We cannot of course be entirely sure about this, since the great majority of inscriptions give no indication of their date of composition. Nevertheless, if the datable inscriptions do provide a general indication of the period when the carving of inscriptions on stone was practised in Lycia, it is noteworthy that the practice did not come into vogue until many decades after the first attestation of a Lycian script. And even then it was the exception rather than the rule, for the large majority of tombs of the epichoric period are completely anepigraphic.

* * *

It would be reasonable to suppose that literacy in the Lycian language was a skill largely confined to a small number of 'specialists', and in any case the carving of inscriptions on the rock tombs must often have been a difficult and hazardous occupation. Very likely there were alternative means for recording the information contained in the inscriptions; perhaps in the case of the sepulchral inscriptions, copies of the tomb owner's instructions were also kept in municipal or temple archives, as we know was the case in later times.¹⁴ Since writing materials are amongst the most perishable of all ancient artifacts, it is

14. A number of the later Greek inscriptions of Lycia contain references to the practice of registering prospective tomb occupants in the public archives; see, e.g., TAM II 85. 5, 164. 8, 861. 8, 881. 5-6, 925. 7-8, 1028. 16-17, 1095. 6.

not particularly surprising that there is no longer any trace of such records. It may be, then, that the rock-cut inscriptions were for the most part secondary records, duplicating in a more monumental way information already contained in the community archives. At all events, the carving of inscriptions on stone was a far from common practice in Lycia during the epichoric period. Whether it was essentially a status symbol, a fashion which came about through outside influences, or whether it was prompted by more practical considerations is at present beyond our means to determine.

As we have noted, the coin legends in the epichoric script began much earlier than the inscriptions on stone, and they cover a rather more extensive period. The earliest coins with legends in this script were struck by the Xanthian dynast Kuprili who held power from c. 485-40, and the youngest coins bearing a person's name were those struck by Perikle who, as indicated above, exercised authority in Lycia during the period c. 380-60. The crushing of the satrap rebellion seems to have put an end to the local mints in the country, though some coins bearing the city name *Arñna* (= Xanthos) may date after the rebellion and were presumably minted with the authority of the Carian satrap under the new administrative arrangements made for Lycia at the end of the rebellion.¹⁵

While almost certainly political factors were responsible for the disappearance of the local mints in Lycia and the ultimate disappearance of the native Lycian coinage, the Lycian language itself may have been in a state of continuing decline throughout the 4th century, corresponding (very likely) to an increasing use of Greek in the country.¹⁶

The gradual encroachment of the Greek language in Lycia is illustrated by a number of inscriptions, which we can categorise as follows:

- (1) Full bilingual inscriptions - i.e. inscriptions in both Lycian and Greek versions which wholly or largely correspond to each other:

15. The Athene coins listed in M 240 (to be discussed in vol. II) may fall into this category.

16. Note the comments of Frei, 1981, 359.

- TL 6, 23, 25, 32, 45, 56, 117, N 312,¹⁷ N Suppl. 2(?).¹⁸
- (2) Part bilingual inscriptions - i.e. inscriptions in both Lycian and Greek, but with one version shorter than, and only partly translating, or summarising, the other:
- (a) TL 44 - the 255-line Xanthos stele inscription, consisting of 243 lines of Lycian¹⁹ and a 12-line Greek epigram (TL 44 c 20-31) which summarises the chief exploits of the author of the inscription.
- (b) N 302 - a sepulchral inscription, containing a full burial list in the Lycian version but only the introductory statement of ownership in the Greek.
- (c) N 311 - a dedicatory inscription, consisting of 8 lines of Greek summarised by 2 lines of Lycian.²⁰ The Greek inscription with translation appears below, pp. 94-95, where it is designated as *Erbolina I*.
- (d) TL 70 - a sepulchral inscription in which only the name of the tomb owner appears in Greek.
- (e) TL 134 - a sepulchral inscription in which only the names of the tomb owner and his wife appear in Greek.
- (f) TL 143 - a sepulchral inscription in which only the names of the tomb owner and his father appear in Greek (the father, however, is not named in the Lycian text).
- (3) N 320 - the trilingual inscription in Lycian, Greek, and Aramaic versions.²¹

17. See Carruba's comments on the inscription, 1979, 79.

18. The Greek version of this text has not yet been published, and is in any case very fragmentary. We cannot be altogether sure that the inscription is in fact a full bilingual.

19. The text on the west side (side d) of the stele is written in the dialect commonly known as 'Lycian B' or 'Milyan'; see below p. 71.

20. For the literature on this inscription, see Metzger, 1966, 108, and 1974, 312; Laroche, 1967, 56; Bousquet, 1975, 141-42; Robert, 1975, 328-30, and 1978, 3-6; Carruba, 1979, 76-78; Neumann, 1979b, 28.

21. For the degree of correspondence between the Lycian and Greek versions, see Metzger, 1979, 42, and Blomqvist, 1982. The Aramaic text is not a true version of the Lycian

- (4) TL 65 - Lycian and Greek inscriptions which are largely independent of each other and appear to correspond only on occasional details.
- (5) N Suppl. 1, the votive inscriptions (in honour of Leto), appearing on the base of a statue set up by Erbbina in the Letoon (referred to above). There are four inscriptions in all, two in Greek and two in Lycian.

We have seen that in addition to Greek another foreign language, Aramaic, is also attested in Lycia during the epichoric period. Apart from the trilingual, there are three known Aramaic texts from Lycia:

(a) TL 152 - on which see Kalinka, 1901, 94.

(b) *Letoon inv. no. 5627*, the first of two fragmentary Aramaic inscriptions discovered during the course of the French excavations in the Letoon. The 6-line inscription, found in 1967, was originally noted by Metzger in RA (1970, 307) and has now been published by Dupont-Sommer, with translation and commentary (1979, 170-72, designated as Fragment araméen A). The surviving portion of the text contains a reference to the citizens of Pinara (line 3) and possibly also to the Lycian town of Pydna (line 5) (Dupont-Sommer, 1979, 172).

(c) *Letoon inv. no. 5743*, designated by Neumann as N 319. The inscription, discovered in 1970, appears in Aramaic and Lycian versions, both of which are very fragmentary. The surviving portion of the 6-line Aramaic text has been published by Dupont-Sommer, with translation and commentary (1979, 173-74, designated as Fragment araméen B).²² Here too a reference occurs to the citizens of Pinara (line 5). The Lycian inscription (on the right face of the monument) consists of 4

and Greek texts, but rather the official rescript for the cult to be established at the Letoon (cf. Garbini, 1977, 269; Gusmani, 1977, 52; Dupont-Sommer, 1979, 133; Hahn, 1981, 52). Most scholars are in agreement that the Lycian text is the original version and the Greek a translation of it (which varies in its degree of precision and accuracy); cf. Gusmani, 1975, 63; Metzger, 1979, 42; Frei, 1981, 359; Blomqvist, 1982, espec. 13-14. Hahn, however, argues that the Greek is the original text (1981, 52).

22. Note that Dupont-Sommer erroneously gives the inv. no. as 2743 on p. 172. It appears correctly as 5743 in the caption to Plate XXIIa in *Fouilles de Xanthos VI*.

lines, in each of which there are now only 5 surviving letters.²³
 If, as Dupont-Sommer suggests, there was a Greek text on the left face of the monument, then we may have in this inscription a second trilingual from the Letoon.²⁴

We might also note in passing an example of the Carian script in Lycia in the legend appearing on a coin issued by Erbbina. On the reverse of the coin, the Carian letters ϵ - η appear, probably the initial letters of Erbbina's name.²⁵

The Lycian Script

From all the evidence at our disposal, we can conclude that on a conservative estimate the Lycian language existed in a written form for at least 170 years - roughly from 500 to 330 - although the script may have been developed earlier and perhaps continued to be used on perishable materials somewhat later. Yet the very limited area in which Lycian was spoken, and the likelihood that facility with the language was confined largely to native speakers made it virtually inevitable that the language would become largely defunct as Lycian society became more cosmopolitan and more susceptible to outside influences. The peculiar features of the language and the fact that it had a relatively short existence, at least in its written form, also help to explain why Lycian today is still largely unintelligible.

23. Correct the information given by Neumann, 1979b, 43, who says that only 7 letters in all survive from the Lycian text.

24. This possibility was already suggested by Laroche, 1974, 84. See also Frei's comments on the Aramaic fragments, 1981, 369-70.

25. See Babelon, 1910, no. 385. For more recent discussions of these letters, see Ševoroškin, 1964, 49, n. 29, Shafer, 1965, 409, and Masson, 1974, 127-30. Masson concludes 'Jusqu'à preuve du contraire, l'équation entre lycien er(bbina) et carien 'e-r' me semble la plus simple et la plus plausible' (p. 130). Note that in the appendix to the collection of Lycian inscriptions in TL, Kalinka includes a Carian inscription from Krya (TL 151). Krya lies in the vicinity of Telmessos, but in Carian not in Lycian territory.

Nevertheless during the last two centuries, various scholars have taken on the task of attempting to unravel the mysteries of the language. The first part of the task, assigning sound values to the symbols used in the Lycian script, was facilitated by the fact that the Lycians took over many of the symbols of the Rhodian version of the Greek alphabet for writing their language;²⁶ this was one of the more positive results of Rhodian-Lycian contact during the first half of the 1st millennium. Thus the Lycian script is predominantly alphabetic, and the majority of Lycian symbols correspond closely to Greek prototypes.

But can we assume that the Lycian symbols represented the same sounds as their prototypes? The general assumption is that for the most part they did, an assumption based largely on a comparison of Greek and Lycian versions of personal names occurring in the bilingual inscriptions, as illustrated by the following:

<u>Greek</u>	<u>Lycian</u>	<u>Text</u>
'Απολλωνῶδης	Pulenyda	TL 6
'Αρτεμηλῦς	Brttimeli	N 320
Κοδάρης	Khudara	TL 143
Κοάτα	Khuwata	TL 134
Μελήσανδρος	Milasāñtra	TL 44 a 45
Μολλιεύς	Mulliyesi	TL 6
Πριανούβης	Priyenuba	TL 25
Πυριμήτης	Purihimeti	TL 6
Σειμίας	(E)seimiya	N 320

26. See Houwink ten Cate, 1965, 3, n. 4, and Neumann, 1969, 367, 371.

From this table it is clear that the Lycians drew heavily on the Greek alphabet for their script, modifying in the process a number of the original Greek letter forms. But it is also clear that a number of their symbols represent sounds which had no close equivalents in Greek.

Perhaps the most noteworthy of the Lycian symbols are those commonly regarded as nasals and transcribed as $\tilde{a}$, $\tilde{e}$, $\tilde{m}$, and $\tilde{n}$. In several cases the symbols are obviously based on letters of the Greek (more particularly the Rhodian Greek) alphabet which are not used elsewhere in the Lycian script - namely Greek χ transcribed as $\tilde{m}$, Ξ transcribed as $\tilde{n}$, and φ transcribed as $\tilde{a}$; this last symbol was almost certainly based on one of the variant forms of Greek epsilon - namely ϵ - but inverted and reversed, perhaps to avoid confusion with it. The other ' $\tilde{a}$ variants' (e.g. $\downarrow\downarrow$, $\downarrow\downarrow$) along with the ' $\tilde{e}$ variants' (e.g. $\varphi\varphi$, φ), seem to have been non-Greek in origin.³¹

We should note too that these symbols show some variation in their actual sound values. While on some occasions they function purely as alphabetic symbols, on other occasions they appear to represent syllables. For instance, the Greek personal name $\Lambda\upsilon\sigma\alpha\nu\delta\rho\omicron\varsigma$ is represented in Lycian in three slightly different ways: (a) $\Lambda\omicron\varsigma\downarrow\tau\pi\tau$ (Lusātra) (TL 90. 2), (b) $\Lambda\omicron\varsigma\Xi\tau\pi\tau$ (Lusñtre) (TL 104. 2-3), (c) $\Lambda\omicron\varsigma\varphi\Xi\tau\pi\tau$ (Lusāñtra) (TL 103. 2). Since $\downarrow$ in alternative (a), Ξ in alternative (b), and $\varphi\Xi$ in alternative (c) are all equivalent to the Greek $\alpha\nu$, it is clear that the first two alternatives ($\downarrow$ and Ξ) represent *syllables* while the two symbols of the third alternative ($\varphi\Xi$) represent *single letters* ($\varphi\Xi = \alpha\nu$). This fluctuation is perhaps due to the fact that the Lycian language was a descendant of the Bronze Age Luwian language, which was written in a syllabic script. Although the Lycians themselves adopted an alphabetic script, at least by the beginning of the 5th century, a few last traces of a syllabic system of writing seem to have persisted in their script for as long as the Lycian language itself survived in written form.³²

31. Kalinka, however, believes that these symbols also are based on Greek letters (1901, 5).

32. For other examples, note the following equivalents: Lycian $\tilde{e}ni$ - Luwian *annis* ($\tilde{e} = an$), Lycian $Azñna$ - Hittite/Luwian *Arinna* ($\tilde{n} = in$), Lycian $Tikeukēpre$ - Greek $\tau\iota\kappa\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\mu\beta\rho\alpha$ ($\tilde{e} = em$). But see Laroche, 1979b, 82.

In general, then, it is clear that the Lycian script had a somewhat hybrid character. While it was predominantly alphabetic, it also contained a small syllabic component which persisted in the written language until the end of the epichoric period, although in a largely fossilised form; while the syllabic symbols sometimes retained their full syllabic value, their function in the epichoric texts was more often a purely alphabetic one.³³ In any case, it is probably quite misleading to represent these symbols as nasal in quality in transcriptions of the Lycian texts. But since the convention of doing so has become so firmly established, it is best to retain it here to avoid confusion.

I have noted above the inscriptions to which it is possible to assign approximate dates on the basis of references which they contain to certain prominent persons living in or in some way associated with Lycia. Can we go a step further than this and use the letter forms in the inscriptions as dating criteria, or at least as a means of arranging the inscriptions in some sort of chronological order? A recent attempt to do this has been made by Laroche (1979b, 55-56) in his comprehensive discussion of the Lycian text of the Letoon trilingual. Laroche begins by listing some of the inscriptions which are roughly datable on historical grounds, then tabulates a number of the symbols which appear in slightly different forms in these inscriptions. Using this procedure, he believes it is possible to trace the evolution of the Lycian letter forms, and thus establish a sequence for a number of inscriptions which are not otherwise datable.

In theory Laroche's proposal seems plausible. But an examination of his tables clearly indicates how slight most of the differences in letter forms are - too slight, in my opinion, to be regarded as any more than minor variations on the part of the individual stone-carvers. We should note too how crude and irregular many of the Lycian inscriptions are in their execution, and this in itself should warn us against attaching too much significance to the relatively small differences in the letter forms appearing in the inscriptions.

There are only four cases where there do seem to be genuine variant letter forms - namely the forms transcribed as *b*, *kh* (or χ),

33. Cf the comments in n. 30 on $\diamond$

ã, and ẽ. (The variants are indicated on p. 54-55). But even in these cases it is difficult to find any significant pattern of distribution, either chronological or regional, within each group of variants - with the possible exception of the ẽ variants. I have discussed elsewhere the possibility that we do see some form of evolution in the ẽ variants, that Ƴ was the earliest of these, and that while Ƴ probably remained in use throughout the epichoric period, it was frequently replaced by Ƴ or Ƴ, and possibly by the other less common variants, in the later inscriptions. However no such pattern is detectable in any of the other three groups of genuine variant forms (*b*, *kh*, *ã*).³⁴

I came to these conclusions by adopting the same type of procedure which was subsequently used by Laroche. But unlike Laroche, I believe that there is no adequate justification for using the Lycian letter forms, apart (perhaps) from the ẽ variants, as a means of dating the Lycian inscriptions in either relative or absolute terms.

The Lycian numerals

The Lycian texts contain a number of numerical symbols, generally in contexts which refer to monetary amounts³⁵ or to groups of persons eligible for burial in the tombs. The symbols are of the following basic types: (a) circles (○); (b) half circles (◐); (c) acute angles (∠); (d) verticals (|); (e) horizontals (-).

These symbols often appear in combination, in the following sequence:

circles - half circles/acutes - verticals - horizontals.

The sequence is made clear in the following list of examples:

○ TL 46.4, 124.13	TL 17.3
◐ TL 11.3, 36.4, 50.2	TL 20.4, 42.4, N 322.4

34. See Bryce, 1976b. While *b* may have been an early form of *ß* as Neumann suggests (1979b, 22; but note Laroche's contrary view, 1979b, 56), it certainly seems to have been used in later inscriptions as well (see Bryce, 1981b, 228-29).

35. In many cases these are probably fees payable in connection with burial arrangements or supervision of the tombs; see Bryce, 1976a.

○ -	TL 26.15	-	TL 2.3, 16.2, 84.6
○ ∠ -	TL 26.14	-) TL	47.3
○ ○ -	TL 26.14	TL	4.5, ³⁶ 38.9, 39.8, 41.5
○	TL 44 a 49	-	TL 3.4, 31.6, 36.5
∠	TL 6.3, 107.1, 131.4	TL	35.1
∠-	TL 145.5	-) TL	114.3
		-> TL	115.3

To what extent are we able to assign numerical values to these symbols? There can be little doubt that the verticals |, ||, |||, |||| represent the numbers 1, 2, 3, and 4 respectively. But the values to be assigned to the other symbols are more problematical.³⁷

We note that the most commonly recurring symbol (apart from the vertical) is ○, which appears both on its own and in combination with one or more of the other symbols. It seems to have been a basic numerical unit, perhaps the number 10, as scholars generally assume.³⁸ And if the full circle does represent 10, then very likely the half circle represents half this amount (cf. Frei, 1976, 9).

On this basis, we can interpret the combination of symbols C || in TL 44 a 49 (se wakhseppddimi:ēti:zehi:hbāti: C || :u[le]) as representing the number 7 (5 + 2). The context in which C || occurs is obscure, but it is just possible that it refers to the slaughter of the seven Arkadian hoplites mentioned in the Greek epigram on the east side of the stele (TL 44 b 29).³⁹ And if so, it provides added support for the interpretation of C as 5, and, by implication, ○ as 10.

The acute symbol ∠ never appears in combination with C, and may in fact be simply a variant form of it.⁴⁰ In TL 107a. 1 it is used to

36. It is uncertain whether ||| or |||| is to be read in TL 4. 5.

37. On the Lycian numeral system in general, see Shafer, 1950, Neumann, 1969, 373, Frei, 1976, 5-16, and 1977, 66-78, Laroche, 1979b, 100-01.

38. See, e.g. Deecke, 1889, 198-99, Shafer, 1950, 258-59, Houwink ten Cate, 1965, 97, n. d on TL 124, Neumann, 1969, 373, Frei, 1976, 9.

39. Cf. Meriggi, 1936, 279 with n. 6, Neumann, 1969, 373, Laroche, 1979b, 101.

40. For ∠ = 5, see the references cited in n. 38, along with Deecke, 1889, 206, and Houwink ten Cate, 1965, 88, n. s on TL 6.

indicate the number of sons belonging to the tomb owner Tele, who has provided for the burial of himself, his wife, his sons, and his sons' wives:

[e]beli:me ti siyēni:tele:se lada:se tideimi:ehbi: $\angle$:sladāi:e-bttehi:lv

Here lies Tele and (his) wife and his $\angle$ sons and their lv wives.

$\angle$ indicates the number of Tele's sons, lv the number of the sons' wives. What value is to be assigned to lv? On the assumption that Lycian society was monogamous, the number of wives must be equal to, or smaller than the number of sons (the latter if one or more sons were unmarried). Thus if $\angle = 5$, lv must represent a number smaller than 5, and is perhaps to be interpreted as 4 (see Shafer, 1950, 258-59). We would then have to assume that there were two ways of representing the number 4 in Lycian - either |||| or lv.⁴¹ There are of course other possibilities, and lv could conceivably be a larger number than $\angle$ if one or more of Tele's sons had married more than once.

The horizontal bar — is generally interpreted as $1/2$.⁴² — a reasonable interpretation if we work on the assumption that the symbol representing the smallest numerical amount appears last when various symbols are used in combination. We note however that in some cases — is followed by > (or >). The most convincing explanation for the latter symbol is, I believe, that given by Shafer who suggests that it is used in the texts purely as a type of punctuation mark (1950, 259-60; cf. Frei, 1976, 12).

Perhaps the most enigmatic of the numerical symbols is that which occurs in the Letoon trilingual, where the monetary amount of 1400 adas in the Lycian text (line 19) is equated with $1\frac{1}{2}$ minas in the Greek (lines 17-18). The value that recent scholars have tentatively assigned to 1400 varies from 18 (Laroche, 1979b, 69) to $22\frac{1}{2}$ (Bryce, 1976a, 177) to 120 (Frei 1977, 66-68). Frei notes that the symbol 14

41. Cf. the Roman numeral system, in which 4 is represented by either IV or IIII

42. This interpretation was first suggested by Meriggi, 1930, 457, and was subsequently discussed by Shafer, 1950, 259-60, and Frei, 1976, 9. Shafer, however, suggested that after $\bigcirc$ (= 10), — represents $1/2$ of 10 (i.e. 5), so that $\bigcirc - = 15$. Similarly, he suggested that $\angle - = 7\frac{1}{2}$.

occurs also in TL 26 (line 13), and assigns the value 100 to it on the basis of its similarity to the Phoenician symbol for 100 (1976, 13-15).⁴³ Thus he interprets 1400 as $100 + 2 \times 10$ (= 120). If this line of reasoning is correct, then on the basis of the trilingual $120 \text{ adas} = 1\frac{1}{2} \text{ minas}$,⁴⁴ in other words there are 80 Lycian adas to the Greek mina. This interpretation has some merit, especially if we can assume that where combinations of symbols occur the symbol representing the largest numerical unit appears first; of course on this basis if $\bigcirc = 10$, then in theory 14 could represent any numerical unit larger than 10. The main difficulty with Frei's proposal is that it assigns a very small value to the Lycian ada - only $1/80$ of a mina - far too small, perhaps, to be feasible for the monetary amounts stipulated in the inscriptions. We will consider this further in vol. II in the course of our discussion of the Lycian coinage.

In general, all the interpretations suggested above for the Lycian numerical symbols must be regarded as very tentative and, we have to admit, produce some very odd-looking fractional amounts in the texts; e.g. $\bigcirc \text{III} - = 13\frac{1}{2}$, $\bigcirc \angle \text{III} - = 18\frac{1}{2}$, $\bigcirc \bigcirc \text{II} - = 22\frac{1}{2}$. The best we can do is to accept these interpretations as providing us with a working hypothesis, which may well be subject to substantial modification if and when new information about the numerical symbols comes to light.

Towards the decipherment of Lycian⁴⁵

The first attempts to decipher Lycian proceeded along etymological lines. Various 19th century scholars postulated links with Syrian, the Iranian group of languages, Greek, Slavic, and Albanian.⁴⁶ However the inconclusiveness of their studies led scholars later in the century to switch the line of approach to the combinatory method. Using this

43. Note that in TL 26. 13 the symbol is slightly different in form - γ .

44. This interpretation is accepted without question by Eichner in his translation of lines 19-22 of the Lycian version of the trilingual (1983, 54).

45. Cf. the survey made by Neumann, 1982/83.

46. See the references cited by Neumann, 1969, 361-62.

method, which was initiated by Pauli, the scholars Six, Deecke, Imbert, Arkwright, and Thurneysen made significant progress towards an understanding of the syntactical structure of Lycian, by comparing recurrent patterns of expression in the various texts. By the end of the century the success of the combinatory method had been fully demonstrated by the collaborative efforts of the Scandinavian scholars Thomsen, Torp, Bugge, and Pedersen who established beyond doubt the main syntactical features of the language.⁴⁷

But little additional progress was made with the decipherment in the early decades of the 20th century until the 1930's when Meriggi further refined the combinatory method and provided a more detailed analysis of the language (see especially Meriggi, 1936). While a number of Meriggi's original conclusions have been modified or amended in the light of recent investigations,⁴⁸ nonetheless his work on the language has proved a major contribution, through the application of the combinatory method, to the field of Lycian scholarship.

On the other hand, the etymologists were also actively at work on the Lycian language during the first half of the 20th century. The scholars of the so-called 'Königsberg school' - Kluge, Bork, and König - attempted to link Lycian with the Caucasian language family, and Kretschmer and Georgiev postulated a link with the language of the 'Cretan-Pelasgians'.⁴⁹ But their studies did not produce conclusions able to stand the test of detailed critical scrutiny.⁵⁰ The first steps towards the final solution of the problem proceeded from a different direction. Hrozný's decipherment of Hittite cuneiform in the 1910's paved the way for a series of studies by Sturtevant and (more notably) Pedersen, comparing the Hittite and Lycian languages. Finally, in

47. References cited by Neumann, 1969, 362-63.

48. Note also Meriggi's own modifications to a number of his original proposals, 1980, 248-50. For a full index of the Lycian words discussed by Meriggi, see the same work, 264-74.

49. References cited by Neumann, 1969, 364-65.

50. More recently Stoltenberg attempted to link Lycian with Etruscan, especially in a work entitled *Die termilische Sprache Lykiens* (1955). His arguments and conclusions are today largely discounted by scholars.

Lykisch und Hittitisch appearing in 1945, Pedersen conclusively demonstrated that Lycian was a member of the Hittite language group. Several years later, Pedersen's conclusions were taken a stage further by Tritsch who proved that Lycian was much more closely related to Luwian, a cognate Indo-European language, than it was to Hittite (1950). In more recent years Houwink ten Cate has undertaken a study of Luwian onomastic elements in Lycia (and Cilicia Aspera),⁵¹ and the relationship between the Lycian and Luwian languages has been analysed in detail by Laroche.⁵²

In view of all these studies, how close can we claim to be to a full understanding of the Lycian language? Let us begin with the more positive side of the picture. The main elements of the language are now quite readily identifiable - verbal, substantival, and pronominal forms, conjunctions, particles, prepositions, adverbs, prefixes and suffixes. The Lycian verbal paradigms, represented in present/future and preterite tenses, and indicative, imperative, and infinitive moods, are closely akin to Luwian paradigms, as a comparison of the following verbal endings indicates:⁵³

51. Especially in his work on the Luwian population groups (1965), in which he also gives an analysis of Lycian syntax and accidence, and translations of a number of Lycian texts.

52. In a series of articles entitled *Comparaison du louvite et du lycien* (1958, 1960, 1967). Note also Gusmani's comparative study of Lycian and Luwian - *Concordanze e Discordanze nella Flessione nominale del Licio e del Luvio* (1960).

53. See also the table in Houwink ten Cate, 1965, 83-84, where the Lycian and Luwian verbal endings are compared with those of Hittite. In addition, note Heubeck, 1982, who argues that the verbal endings -idi, -eiti (as in *ttlidi*, *ttleiti*, *tubidi*, *tubeiti*), are not interchangeable variants of either 3rd sing. or 3rd plur. verbs in the present tense, as a number of scholars have supposed. Heubeck, taking up a proposal already made by several other scholars, demonstrates in some detail that -idi is likely to be a 3rd sing. ending and -eiti a 3rd plur. ending. Cf. Neumann, 1983, 141-42.

	Luwian	Lycian
<u>Present tense</u>		
1st sing.	-u ⁱ	-u
3rd sing.	-ti	-ti/-di
3rd plur.	-nti	*-nti
<u>Preterite tense</u>		
1st sing.	-ha	-ka ^(u) /-ga ^(u)
3rd sing.	-ta	-te ^(u)
3rd plur.	-nta	*-nte ^(u)
<u>Imperative</u>		
3rd sing.	-du/-tu	-tu
3rd plur.	ndu/-ntu	*-ntu
<u>Infinitive</u>	-una	-āna/-āne

This is merely one instance of the many close relationships between Lycian and Luwian which have been treated at some length by Tritsch, Houwink ten Cate, and Laroche. The Lycian substantives are divided into two basic declensions, an *a*-stem declension and an *i*-stem declension, with a full range of oblique cases (acc., gen., dat./loc., and abl.) (see Houwink ten Cate, 1965, 52-55). One of the most distinctive features of Lycian is the adjectival suffix in *-ahi-*, which exactly parallels the Luwian suffix *-ašši-*, as Houwink ten Cate has clearly demonstrated (1965, 55-56, 59-61). The range of pronominal forms in Lycian are also clearly identifiable - demonstrative, possessive, interrogative and relative, indefinite - and also closely related to their Luwian counterparts.⁵⁴ Knowledge of these and other elements enables us to analyse fairly precisely the syntactical structure of most of the Lycian texts, and this provides an important basis for the task of actually deciphering these texts.

As we have already noted, the great majority of texts are of the sepulchral variety, and for the most part these present relatively few problems of interpretation, especially in view of their highly formulaic nature. The simplest of these merely indicate who the tomb owner is, and in most cases who are eligible for burial in his tomb; e.g., TL 7:

54. See the tables in Houwink ten Cate, 1965, 65-69.

ebēññē:khupā:me ne prñnawatē Triyē[tezi]:se ne piyet[ē]
ladi:eh[b]i se tideime

This tomb Triyētezi has built it and he has allocated it to his wife and children.

Inscriptions which contain more detailed burial instructions are still reasonably intelligible, although almost invariably they contain a number of words and phrases whose precise meaning remains obscure; e.g. TL 88:

ebēññē prñnawā me ne prñnawatē ddaqasa sttuleh:tideimi hrpi
ladi ehbi se tideime se eke lati ddaqasa me ne ñtepi tāti
ñtipa tezi se ladā ehbi kbi tike mei nipe ñtepi tātu tibe
nipe hlūmi tuwetu hlūmi mei tuwetu tike tibe ñtepi tadi
tike me ne itlehi tubeiti trūmili huwedri se trqqas:se
māhāl huwedri

This building Ddaqasa, son of Sttuli, has built it for his wife and children. And when Ddaqasa dies (?), they shall place him within the inscribed/sculptured (?) sarcophagos, and (also) his wife. (But) let them not place anyone else within (the sarcophagos), nor set up a *hlūmi*. If anyone sets up a *hlūmi* here or places anyone (else) within, the *huwedri* Lycian *itlehi* and (the god) *Trqqas*, and the *huwedri* gods will punish him.

At present we are unable to determine precisely the meaning of *hlūmi*, *huwedri*, or *itlehi*. Various possibilities have been suggested,⁵⁵ but none of them can be regarded as any more than intelligent guesses.

The task of decipherment has been facilitated to some extent by the small number of bilingual texts, referred to earlier in this chapter, in Lycian and Greek versions. These provided the 19th century Lycian scholars with the meaning of a few Lycian words, as illustrated by TL 117, the first bilingual to be discovered:

55. On *hlūmi*, see below, n. 81; on *huwedri*, see p. 173 ; on *itlehi*, see pp. 135-36.

*ebeiya : erawaziyah : me ti : prñnnawatē sideriya parm[ēnah]
tideimi [h]rppi etli ehbi se ladi:ehbi:se tideimi:pubieleye*

τὸ μνημα τὸδ' ἐποιήσατο Σιδάριος Παρμένοντος υἱὸς ἐαυτῶ
καὶ τῆς γυν[α]ικὸς καὶ υἱῶν Πυβιάλη

This tomb, Sideriya, son of Parmēna, has built (it) for himself and his wife and (his) son Pubiele.

We can establish from this inscription the following Lycian-Greek equivalents:

<i>ebeiya</i> -	τοῦτο τό	<i>tideimi</i> -	υἱός
<i>erawaziya</i> -	μνημα	<i>etli ehbi</i> -	ἐαυτῶ
<i>prnnawate</i> -	ἐποιήσατο	<i>se</i> -	καὶ
<i>Sideriya</i> -	Σιδάριος	<i>ladi</i> -	γυναικί
<i>Parm[enah]</i> -	Παρμένοντος	<i>Pubieleye</i> -	Πυβιάλη

Other bilinguals provided additional information on such matters as terms of relationship; e.g. TL 25a in which the Lycian word *kbatra* ('daughter') is equated with the Greek θυγατήρ, and Lycian *tuhes* ('nephew/niece') with Greek ἀδελφιδόϋς and ἀδελφιδῆν. We might also note the bilingual TL 56 which provides the information that the Lycian mother goddess referred to as *ēni qlahi ebiyehi* ('the mother of this sanctuary(?)') was equated with the Greek goddess Leto.

Yet the bilinguals have helped little in overcoming the major problem still confronting scholars in their attempts to decipher fully the Lycian language. This problem can be stated in one word - vocabulary. In spite of the most exhaustive comparative studies by French, Danish, German, Italian, Dutch, Russian, and English scholars, relatively few Lycian words are known to have counterparts or cognates in Luwian, or in any other language for that matter. And the inscriptions discovered since Kalinka's 1901 edition throw very little new light on the lexical problems posed by the language. The majority of 'new' inscriptions follow formulaic patterns which are already well known from TL, and any deviations from these patterns immediately present new problems of interpretation.

Undoubtedly the most important new find is the trilingual inscription discovered at the Letoon in 1973. The trilingual has already

led to a plethora of publications,⁵⁶ the most comprehensive and authoritative of which is *Fouilles de Xanthos VI* (Paris, 1979) which contains a detailed treatment of the three versions of the text.⁵⁷ From a linguistic point of view, the trilingual has to some respects proved a little disappointing. While it has certainly provided a number of new Lycian words, it does little to solve many of the longstanding and most puzzling problems of the Lycian language. Moreover the Lycian text in itself presents a number of difficulties, especially in passages which do not correspond closely with the Greek or Aramaic versions.⁵⁸

On the credit side, the trilingual has contributed to a partial understanding of several of the obscure passages occurring elsewhere in the Lycian inscriptions. TL 84, a sepulchral inscription, is a case in point. The tomb owner Mizretiye makes the usual burial provisions, but then continues with a series of instructions whose main intention has up to the present been almost totally obscure: *se dadē hrñmā: iyase:atlahimede tew[ē] kumezeiti:uhazata:tueri se mizratiyehe:kumehi (lines 3ff.)*. Several of the key words in this passage occur also in the Lycian version of the trilingual. For instance, *hrñma* is almost certainly the same word as *hrñmada* in N 320. 14⁵⁹ which is equated with ἀγρόν in the Greek version of the text. It is clear from the trilingual that *hrñmada* refers to a cultivated area of land (where buildings have been erected) which is to be resumed by the local authorities for use in connection with the newly established cult. From this we can infer that *hrñma* in TL 84 may also refer to an area set aside for a religious purpose. This is supported by a close parallel which we can draw between TL 84. 5 *mede tew[ē] kumezeiti*

56. A comprehensive bibliography of the scholarship on the trilingual is provided by Eichner, 1983, 53.

57. The Greek, Lycian, and Aramaic versions of the inscription are discussed by Metzger, Laroche, and Dupont-Sommer respectively, as a follow-up to their initial summary treatment of the texts in CRAI 1974.

58. E.g. lines 20-21 and 40-41. On the former, see the discussions of Carruba, Heubeck, Neumann, and Gusmani, and Ševoroškin in *Incontri linguistici* 4, 1978, 89-98, and 238-39.

59. *hrñmada* in the trilingual is qualified by *ttaraha* (of/belonging to the town'), and is perhaps a plural form of *hrñma*. See also Carruba's comments, 1977, 247-48.

uhazata tuweri and *N 320. 26-28 mede tewē kumezidi nuredi nuredi arā kumehedi seu hazata uwadi*. In the latter passage (*se*)*uhazata* corresponds to κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν in the Greek version of the text ('yearly') and thus provides the meaning of *uhazata* in *TL 84*. Both passages make provision for sacrifice at regular intervals – *TL 84* once yearly (*uhazata*), and *N 320* once monthly with a victim (*nuredi nuredi kumehedi*) and once yearly with an ox (*uhazata uwadi*). In the light of these parallels, it now seems clear that the second half of *TL 84* is concerned with the provision of a funerary cult, or at least an annual sacrifice, in honour of the deceased. (see Bryce, 1980b). The text and a translation of the whole of *TL 84* appear below, pp. 77–78.

As mentioned earlier, the trilingual provides for the establishment of a cult in honour of two deities. The first of these two deities is referred to in the Lycian version as *khñtawata khbidēñni*, corresponding to *Basileus Kaunios* in the Greek version. The Lycian word *khñtawata*, connected with Luwian *hantawata* (see Laroche, 1959, 40), occurs a number of times elsewhere in the Lycian inscriptions, apparently in reference to a high ranking military or civilian post. In the trilingual, however, it is used in reference to a god, qualified in this instance by *khbidēñni*. This latter is equivalent to the Greek ethnic *Kaunios* – 'belonging to Kaunos', and must therefore be the Lycian ethnic of the Carian town Kaunos. *-ēñni* is a common ethnic suffix in Lycian, and we can deduce from this that the Lycian word for Kaunos is *Khbide*.⁶⁰

Without doubt important advances have been made in the study of the Lycian language, especially since the late 19th century when the Scandinavian scholars made clear the basic syntactic structure of the language, and in more recent years when Lycian was firmly established as a member of the Luwian language group. Yet a complete decipherment of Lycian is still a long way off, and will never in fact be achieved until such time as a demonstrably correct translation of the Xanthos stele inscription (*TL 44*) can be produced. At present we can

60. On *Khbide*, the Lycian name for Kaunos, cf. Laroche, 1979b, 64, and 83, n. 7 (Laroche argues that the names Kaunos and *Khbide* are of quite different origin), and Frei, 1981, 361 (who argues that they may be the same). See also O. Masson, 1977, 91.

do no more than speculate on the main contents of the inscription, which appears to deal principally with the military exploits of a ruling Lycian dynasty based at Xanthos, dedications to various deities, and cult practices associated with these deities. This information is provided partly by the 12-line Greek epigram on the north side of the stele, and partly by a few translatable words, phrases, and sentences in the Lycian text, which give at least some indication of the context in which they occur.

The problems of translation are further compounded by the fact that the west side (*side d*) of the stele is written in a dialect different from that of the other three sides. This dialect, commonly known as 'Lycian B' or 'Milyan', occurs also in *TL 55*, which is almost completely unintelligible. Lycian B is obviously related to the predominant Lycian dialect appearing in all other inscriptions, and is perhaps an earlier form of it;⁶¹ but the precise nature of the relationship between the two is still a matter for speculation.

Given the present state of our knowledge of the Lycian language, we can only hope that future excavations will provide a significant number of new bilingual texts, perhaps even another trilingual, to facilitate further progress with the language. But even with the present limitations, the inscriptions do provide important information on Lycian institutions and offices, on religion and cult practices, on burial practices, and on family relationships as mirrored in the various tomb families. This information serves as a valuable basis for a more general study of Lycian history and civilisation, and is an important complement to the evidence provided by the numismatic and archaeological material of Lycia.

Selections from the Lycian Inscriptions

A. The sepulchral inscriptions

The sepulchral inscriptions contain a range of information about the

61. See Pedersen, 1945, 14, n. 1, and Neumann, 1961, 46, par. 22 and 1969, 366 and 373 (sec. 11b). For some suggestions as to the interpretation of a number of Lycian B words, see Gusmani, 1968; and for a discussion of nouns, personal names, and pronouns in Lycian B, see Meriggi, 1980, 250–64.

various tomb owners and the arrangements which they made for the occupancy of their tombs. This information, which is illustrated by the selection of inscriptions below, can be collectively summarised within the following categories:

- (a) statement of ownership and identification of the tomb owner
- (b) the list of eligible tomb occupants
- (c) accommodation arrangements within the tomb
- (d) statement of what constitutes a violation of the owner's instructions
- (e) the disciplinary agents responsible for punishing offenders, and (sometimes) the penalty to be inflicted
- (f) arrangements made with the local *miñti* (to be discussed in Chapter 5)
- (g) a quasi-dating formula (*ēñē...khñtawata*) (to be discussed in Chapter 5)
- (h) instructions for sacrificial rites in honour of the deceased.

The inscriptions which follow illustrate various combinations of the above categories, and range from those which contain no more than basic information about the tomb owner himself to those which encompass most of the information detailed above. These inscriptions will also provide a useful source of reference for the discussion to follow in Chapter 5 on Lycian social customs and institutions.

The texts transcribed below are taken from Friedrich's edition of the TL inscriptions appearing in *Kleinasiatische Sprachdenkmäler*, pp. 54-88, with some modifications and several additional restorations. The texts of the post-TL inscriptions, prefixed with the letter *N*, are taken from Neumann's *Neufunde lykischer Inschriften seit 1901*. As they appear here, the transcribed texts differ from those of the above editions in the representation of *ṽ* as *kh* (instead of *k* in Friedrich and *χ* in Neumann), *κ* as *k* (instead of *c* in Friedrich), and *l* as *y* (instead of *j* in Friedrich and Neumann).

The translations which I offer below involve a substantial amount of conjecture. No doubt there will be many points where other scholars in the field will disagree with my proposals. Particularly doubtful phrases in the translations are indicated by italics.

TL 1 *ebēññē khupā me ne prñna<wa>tē khudali zuhriyah tideimi[h]*
khezrimeh prñneziyehi

This tomb Khudali, son of Zuhriya, member-of-the-household of Khezrima/e/i⁶² has built it.

3 *ebēññē:khupā:me ti prñnawātē:tewinezēi:[s]ppñtazah:*
asawāzalah tideimi:hrppi:ladi:se tide[ime] miñti:
adaiyē III-

This tomb Tewinezēi, son of Sppñtaza Asawāzala, has built it for (his) wife and children. For the *miñti* 3½ adas.

4 *ebēññ:prñnawā:me [t]i prñnawātē:telekhuzi:hrpi ladi:*
ehb:se tideimi sedi⁶³ ñta [t]adē tesi:miñti:aladehali:
adē III (or IIII ?)

This building Telekhuzi has built (it) for his wife and son. And the *miñti* has imposed here the following contract (??): for the (burial) arrangements (??)⁶⁴ 3 (or 4?) adas.

6 *ebēññē ñtatā me ne prñnawātē pulenyda mulliyeseh se*
dapara pulenydah purihimeteḥ pr[ñ]neziyehi hrppi lada
eptteḥ se tideime se iye tiseri tadi tike ñtat[a] ebehi
me iye [tu]be[it]i punamaḥḥi aladahali: ada *Λ*
τοῦτο τὸ μνημα ἐργάσαντο Ἀπολλωνίουδης Μολλίσυος καὶ
Λαπάρης Ἀπολλ[ω]νίουδου Πυριμάτιος οἰκέτου ἐπε ταῦς
γυναιξίν ταῦς ἑαοτῶν [κα]ὶ τοῦ[ς] ἐγγόνους καὶ ἄν
τις ἀδικήσῃ τὸ μνημα τοῦτο ἐξώλεα [κ]αὶ πανώλεα εὔη
δοτῶν πάντων

62. The gen. ending *eh(e)* is found in *i-*, *e-*, and very occasionally also in *a-* stem personal names. It is therefore often difficult to determine from the gen. form what the nom. form is unless the latter is separately attested (see Meriggi, 1980, 215-20).

63. For an analysis of *sedi*, see Bryce, 1976a, 176, n.7.

64. The interpretation of the whole statement is conjectural. For a discussion of this and similar statements in other sepulchral inscriptions, see Bryce, 1976a.

This chamber Pulyenya, (son) of Mulliyesi, and Dapara, (son) of Pulyenya, members-of-the-household of Purihimeti, have built it for their wives and children. And who (ever) places anyone with them in the chamber of this (tomb) *me iye* he will punish *punamaṣṣi*. For the (burial) arrangements (??), 5(?) adas.

- 7 *ebēñnē:khupā:me ne prñnawatē triyē[tezi]:se ne piyet[ē] ladi:eh[b]i se tideime*
This tomb Triyētezi has built it and has allocated⁶⁵ it to his wife and children.

- 8 *ebēñnē:khupā me ne prñnawatē:triyētezi:se ne piyetē nēne:ehbiye:se tuhe*
This tomb Triyētezi has built it, and has allocated it to his brothers and nephews/nieces.

- 11.1-2 *ebēñnē prñnawā:mē:ti prñnawatē:ddapssūma:padrñmah: tid[eimi] hrppi prñnezi:ehbi*
This building Ddapssūma, son of Padrñma, has built (it) for his household.

- 36 *ebēñnē:prñnawā:me ne prñnawatē ahqqadi:pizibideh:tideimi: se:hñprāme:tuhe:se iye ñta tadē:miñti aladehali:ada: 0-seyētri:ñtata:ada: ||- se piyetē hrzzi:ñtatā:ladi:ehbi: se mñneteidehe esedēñnewi) se piyetē:ētri:ñtatā:prñnezi: atlahi:*
This building Ahqqadi, son of Pizibida/i and nephew of Hñprāma, has built it. And the *miñti* has imposed here (the following contract) (??): for the (burial) arrangements (??), 10½ (?) adas, and for the lower chamber, 3½ adas. And he has allocated the upper

65. For the interpretation of the verb *piye-* as "allocate" in contexts of this kind, see Bryce, 1975.

chamber to his wife and the blood-relatives⁶⁶ of Mñneteida/i; and he has allocated the lower chamber to his own household.

- 37 *ebēñnē:khupā:mē ne prñnawatē:mede:epññēni ehbi:hñprāma: seyatli*
This tomb Mede has built it for his younger brother(?)⁶⁷ Hñprāma and himself.

- 39 *ebēñnē:prñnawu:me ti prñnawate mēmruwi:khñtenubeh: tideimi hrppi esedēñnewi:khñnahi ehbiehi:se ḡurttāi: lada señne:sñmati tiyāi:kbiyehis:meñne:niyesu esedēñnewi: epttehi:ñtepi tane se iye:ñta tātē:tesi miñti:aladahali: ada: |||*
This building Mēmruwi, son of Khñtenuba, has built (it) for the blood-relatives of his grandmother and the wives of the ḡurttas *señne:sñmati tiyāi*.⁶⁸ Others however may not be placed within by their blood-relatives (lit. others however let it not be permitted (?) to their blood-relatives to place within). The *miñti* have imposed upon them the (following) contract (??): for the (burial) arrangements (??), 3 adas.

- 49 *ebehi:isbazi:mi iye siyēni:padrñma:kumaza:me iye ne pemati tike:kbi hrppi ttāne:*
On the couch of this tomb lies Padrñma, sacrificial priest,⁶⁹ and he does not permit (??)⁷⁰ to place anyone else upon him.

66. For the interpretation of *esedēñnew-* as "blood-relative, see below, pp. 147-50.

67. For *epññēni* as "younger brother", see Laroche, 1957-58, 192, and cf. Houwink ten Cate, 1965, 91 (translation of TL 37).

68. On the term *ḡurtta*, see below, p.135. For a possible interpretation of *señne:sñmati tiyāi*, see Thomsen, 1899, 61-62, and Bryce, 221-22.

69. For *kumaza* as "sacrificial priest", see below, p. 131.

70. "does not permit" is the translation proposed by Houwink ten Cate for *ne pemati* (1965, 92).

- 52 *ebññē:khupā:mē nadē:krehēnube:sē piyētē:waziye*
seyēni:se pi[y]etē:miñti ñta wātā
 This tomb Krehenube has made it; and they have allocated
 (it) to Waziye and (his) mother. And the *miñti* has
 granted burial rights (??)⁷¹
- 56 *ebēññē prñnawū:me ti prñnawatē ikhtta:hlah:tideimi:hrppi*
ladi:ehbi se tideime:ehbiye se iye ti edi:tike:mētē:me
ne gasttu:ēni:qlahi:ebiyehi:se wedri:wehñtezi
 'Ἰκτας Λα 'Αντιφελλίου τοῦτ' τὸ μνημα ἡρώατο αὐτῶ[ι]
 τε καὶ γυναικὶ καὶ τέκνοις ἐὰν δέ τις ἀδικήσῃ ἢ
 ἀγοράσῃ τὸ μνημα ἢ Λητῶ αὐτὸν ἐπι[ρ]ύ[ψ]ε[ι]
 This building Ikhtta, son of Hla, has built (it) for
 his wife and his children. And who(ever) commits an
 offence(?) against them, let the mother of this
 sanctuary(?) and the municipality of Wehñta (= Phellos)
 pass judgment upon him.
- 57 *ebēññē:khupu:me ti prñnawatē:ida makhzza uheriyeh*
tideimi:hrppi:ladi ehbi:se tideime:sei piyētē piyatu
miñti:ētri:khupu:sikhli:aladehkhkhāne:se hrzzi tūpmme:
sikhla:hrzzi prñnawi:mei:ñtepi tāti i[dā: m]akhzzā:
se la[dā d.. s]e [iye] n[e hrppi tā]ti tike kbi:hrppiye
mei:tadi:tike:me ne:tubeiti:māhāi huwedri:se itlehi:
trñmili:ebidalahaditi:ebei:ñte
 This tomb Ida Makhzza, son of Uheriya/i, has built (it)
 for his wife and children. And the *miñti* have given
 approval (??) to him/them⁷² to arrange/prepare(?) the
 lower tomb for one shekel and the upper (tomb) for
 two(?) shekels. In the upper building they will place
 within Ida Makhzza and (his) wife .. and they will not
 place anyone else upon them. If (someone) places anyone
 (else) upon them, the *huwedri* gods and the Lycian

71. "burial rites" is a very tentative translation of *ñta wātā*;
 cf. Houwink ten Cate, 1965, 92.

72. Various interpretations have been proposed for the clause
sei piyētē piyatu:miñti. See the discussion in Bryce, 1975,
 37-40.

- itlehi* will punish him *ebidalahaditi:ebei:ñte*.
- 61 *ebē:prñnawā:me ti:prñnawatē:sbikeziyēi:mrekhisa <h>:*
tideimi ladi ehbi:se tideime:ēñē:khñtawata:wataprddatehe:
 This building Sbikeziyēi, son of Mrekhisa, has built
 (it) for his wife and children. Under the command
 of Wataprddate (= Autophradates).
- 75 *ebēññē:khupā:mē ne [pr]ñnawatē:tett[ñ]pe:hñtihamā:*
tidei[mi] se ne ñte:tāti tdi i[s]bazi:me iye:ni hr[ppi]
tātu:tike:ñmē:ladā tiye h[rpp]i:la[t.] hrppi[...]:i:
tadi:tike:kbi:mē ne tubidi:q[l]a[y]eb[i s]e maliya:
se t[asa]:⁷³ miñtaha
 This tomb Tettñpe, son of Hñtihamā, has built it, and
 on the couch where they shall place him⁷⁴ let them not
 place anyone else except (??)⁷⁵ (his) wife. Who(ever)
 places anyone else upon them, the sanctuary (?) here
 and Maliya and the oaths of the *miñti*⁷⁶ will punish
 him.
- 84 *ebēññē:prñnawā:me ti:prñnawatē:mizretiye:murāzah:tuhes:*
mluhidaza:surezi hrppi atli:ehbi:se ladi:se tideime:
ehbiye:se dadē:atli:hrzzē ispaziyē:me te:ñta tāti ebññē:
hātā:se ladā:hrppiye mei:tadi:tike:tike:me ne gla:
[q]a[ss]ttebi:surezi:se dadē hrñmā:iyase:atlahi:me
pēti hākhkhati:mluhidaza:ddeipñte:khi tēpi:terñ
mluhidazāi medi:ñte khultti:hrñmā:pñtbahi:ñte nē:khruwi.
mede tew[e] kumezeiti:uhazata:tuweri se mizratiyehe:
kumehi:adaiye: || - :uraziyē [...] adi:ē:seyepi hadi ti:

73. *t[asa]* is a restoration to Friedrich's text. On *tesi/tasa*,
 see Bryce, 1976a, 184-85.

74. On the translation of this clause, see Laroche, 1960, 176,
 and Houwink ten Cate, 1965, 95, n.a. on TL 75.

75. "except" is a tentative translation of *ñmē*, suggested by
 Houwink ten Cate, 1965, 95.

76. Presumably this means that the *miñti* has undertaken an oath
 to safeguard the tomb and to punish anyone violating the
 owner's instructions.

[s]e mei ne:kumazati:me ne:ppdē:qla:sñmati:ebi:surezi
 This building Mizretiye, nephew of Muraza, mluhidaza
 at Sura, has built (it) for himself and (his) wife and
 his children. And he has made (i.e. reserved?) for
 himself the upper couch, and they will place within
 there this person(?) and his wife. If (anyone) places
 someone else upon them, the sanctuary(?) here at Sura
 will punish him. And he (i.e. Mizretiye) has made (set
 aside?) a hrñma⁷⁷ for his own iyase. me peti ...
 khruwi:mede tew[e] the tuweri⁷⁸ will make sacrifice
 yearly, and will make (i.e. provide?) a victim (in
 honour?) of Mizretiye (to the value of?) 2½ uraziyē
 adas.⁷⁹ [...] adi:ē: And whom(ever) one appoints(?)
 (i.e. as the person responsible for conducting the
 sacrifice), if he does not become sacrificer, the local
 sanctuary(?) here at Sura will hold him responsible(?)⁸⁰

- 86 ebēññē:prñnawā:mē ti prñnawatē:erimñnuha:semuteh:tideimi:
 hrppi:atli:ehbi:seyēni:ehbi
 This building Erimñnuha, son of Semuta/i has built (it)
 for himself and his mother.

- 88 ebēññē prñnawā me ne prñnawatē ddaqasa-sttuleh:tideimi
 hrpi ladi ehbi se tideime se ēke lati ddaqasa me ne
 ñtepi tāti ñtipa tezi se ladā ehbi kbi tike mei nipe
 ñtepi tātu tibeī nipe hlñmi tuwetu hlñmi mei tuwetī
 tike tibeī ñtepi tadi tike me ne itlehi tubeiti trñmili.
 huwedri se trqqas:se mähāi huwedri
 This building Ddaqasa, son of Sttuli, has built it for
 his wife and children. And when Ddaqasa dies(?) they

77. On hrñma, see above, p. 69.

78. tuweri is perhaps a term of family relationship; see Bryce, 1980b, 46.

79. uraziyē appears to qualify adaiyē, but its meaning is unknown. See Bryce, 1980b, 45.

80. For a discussion of the interpretation of the last clause, see Bryce, 1980b, 48. To the references contained therein add Meriggi, 1980, 243, sec. 78, Frei, 1981, 362.

will place him within the inscribed(?) sarcophagos,
 and (also) his wife. (But) let them not place anyone
 else within (the sarcophagos) nor set up a hlñmi.⁸¹
 If anyone sets up a hlñmi here or places anyone (else)
 within (the sarcophagos), the huwedri Lycian itlehi
 and Trqqas and the huwedri gods will punish him.

- 89 khupā:ebēññē:mē nadē:hri[khñ]ma nēne:ehbiye:mei ñtepi
 tasñti:ēnehi:hrikhñma [...] esedēññewē:adi meyē:tik:e:
 khttbā:tisñke:mē ne:i[t]lehi:qāti:trñmili:seipm:pablāti
 tiyāi
 This tomb Hrikhñma has made it for his brothers. And
 they will place within here the blood-relatives of the
 mother of Hrikhñma. If anyone commits any offence(?),
 the Lycian itlehi will pass judgment upon him seipm:
 pablāti tiyāi.

- 91 ebēññē pr[ñ]nawā me ne prñnawatē khlppasi khssēñziyah
 tid[eimi mei ñtepi tāti]⁸² khlppasi se ladu e[h]bi se
 iye ni hrppi tātu tike atlahi ti[be kbiye] meiy]⁸³

81. Imbert suggested that a hlñmi may have been a cremation urn (1896, 227). Thomsen preferred to think of it as "un objet neutre tel que pierre, table commemorative ou quelque chose de semblable" (1899, 53-54). hlñmi appears also in the trilingual (line 25) where it is associated with piyata, but it is still not possible to fix a precise meaning upon the word. Laroche translates line 25 of the trilingual as "et tout le profit que l'on en retirera" (1979b, 72), and Houwink ten Cate has suggested to me that hlñmipiyata could perhaps be translated as "additional gifts". Some importance should, I think, be attached to the fact that in both TL 88 and 93 hlñmi is used with the verb tuwe- which elsewhere is used with sarcophagoses, stelae, and statues - i.e. erected monuments. This may indicate that a hlñmi could refer to something that was set up either in the tomb itself, or at least in its vicinity. Perhaps this was a common practice, unless for some reason or other it was expressly forbidden, as in the case of TL 88 and 93. See also Carruba, 1978, 306ff. ('Zusatz', 'Hinzufügung') and Frei, 1981, 362 ('Zusatzgabe').

82. An additional restoration to Friedrich's text by Houwink ten Cate, (1965, 96).

83. A further addition by Houwink ten Cate to Friedrich's text (ibid.).

adi tike ti[h]e zu[m]mā meweyesu httēmi
 This building Khlppasi, son of Khssēñziya, has built
 it. And they shall place within Khlppasi and his wife.
 Let them not place anyone (else) upon them, whether
 from his own (i.e. Khlppasi's) or from someone else's
 (family). If someone commits an offence(?) here, let
 him be answerable(?)⁸⁴

- 93 e[b]ēñn[ē] kh]upā mē t[i] p]rñn[a]watē upazi muskhkhah
 tideimi hrppi ladi:ehbi:se tideime:statti [t]i [me]i
 [ñ]t[ep]i t[āt]i upazi se ladu:ehbi kbi tike mei nipe
 ñtepi tātu tibe hlūmi tuwe[tu] [..]ahi[.].i:hlūmi
 mei tuweti tike tibe ñt[epi] tadi tike mē ne trqqas
 tubidi se muhāi huwedri:
 This tomb Upazi, son of Muskhkha, has built (it) for
 his wife and children sttati ti. And they will place
 within here Upazi and his wife. Let them not place
 anyone else within nor erect a hlūmi [..]ahi[.].i. If
 anyone erects a hlūmi here or places anyone (else)
 within, Trqqas and the huwedri gods will punish him.

- 94.1-2 ebēñnē:prñna[w]ā:me ti:prñnawate:hurttuw[e]ti:hrppi
 ladi:m[e] ne ñtepi tati hrzzi prñnawi:se ladā:ehbi:se
 hakhānā:se [iy]e ne:hrppi tāti:tik[e]:h[rpp]i[i]y]e m[e]i:
 tadi [t]ike:me ne:itlehi:qāñti:trūmili:
 This building Hurttuweti has built (it) for his wife.
 And they will place him and his wife and Hakhāna within
 the upper building, and they will not place anyone
 (else) upon them. If (someone) places anyone (else)
 upon them, the Lycian itlehi will pass judgment upon
 him.

84. On the possible meaning of *httēmi* ("answerable/responsible?"),
 see most recently Bryce, 1981b, 228.

- 101 ebēñnē:khupā:me ti prñnawatē:za[h]ama:ddawāpartah
 tideimi:me ñtepi tāti:za[h]amā:se lada:se:tideimis:
 ehbi[s] kbi:tike:ti ñtepi tadi:a[t]la[h]i:tibe:kbiyehi
 tibe te:ala[h]adi ti:me ne mā[h]āi:tubeiti wed[reñ]ni
 This tomb Zahāma, son of Ddawāparta, has built (it).
 And they will place within Zahāma and (his) wife and
 his children. Who(ever) places anyone else within
 whether from his own (i.e. Zahāma's) or another's
 (family) or who(ever) lays out/arranges(?) (anyone
 else) there (OR makes (other) burial arrangements
 there(?)), the regional⁸⁵ gods will punish him.
- 102 ebēñnē:khupā:mē ti prñnawatē:skkhutrazi mē ne:ñtepi
 tēti:skkhutrazi:se ladu:ehbi se tideimis:ehbis:ti
 ñte:hri:alahadi:tike:tibe ñte ti:hrppi tadi:tike:me
 ttleiti puwa:aitāta:añmāma:qebeliya:ēni:qlahi:ebiy[e]hi
 pñ]ñ[treñni:sewe:tubidi:pdē khba
 This tomb Skkhutrazi has built (it). And they will
 place within Skkhutrazi and his wife and his children.
 Who(ever)arranges/lays out(?) anyone (else) within
 on top, or who(ever) places anyone (else) within upon
 (them) will pay⁸⁶ aitāta⁸⁷ cattle as a penalty(?)⁸⁸

85. On the meaning of *wedreñni* ("regional"), see Bryce, 1981a, 83.
 86. It seems preferable to translate *ttleiti*, *ttlidi* as "to make payment" (with *ēni qlahi ebiyehi* as its indirect object), rather than "to impose, inflict" (with *ēni qlahi ebiyehi* as its subject). The verb may well be cognate with *tlakhñta*, which appears in lines 19-20 of the trilingual, where it stands in apposition to the *ada* expression and obviously means "payment". See also Heubeck, 1982, 113-14, Eichner, 1983, 54-55, n.44.
 87. *aitāta* is one of several numerical expressions which occur in alphabetic form in the epichoric texts. Others are *kbiñtāta* (TL 111.3 and 4), *nuñtāta* (TL 131.3), and *kūma sñta* (TL 149.9). Meriggi in his discussion of the Lycian numerals proposed the following values: *kbiñtāta* - 20, *aitāta* - 80, *nuñtāta* - 90, *sñta* - 100, *kūma sñta* - 500 (1936, 266-68). And in more recent times other scholars have suggested similar values; e.g. Laroche: *kbiñtāta* - 20 or 200, *nuñtāta* - 90 or 900 (1967, 47), Neumann: *nuñtāta* - 90? *sñta* - 100? (1969, 368, 394), *aitāta* - "wahrscheinlich ein höheres Zahlwort, vermutlich die Bezeichnung einer Dekade" (1974,

gebeliya to the pñtreñni⁸⁹ mother of this sanctuary(?)
sewe:tubidi:pdē:khba.⁹⁰

- 106.1 ebehi khupa:mei ti siyēni:sbi: ♦ :aza:šurtta:miñtehi
pddēneh:ñmi:⁹¹
In the chamber⁹² of this (tomb) (it is) Šbikaza, šurtta,
chairman(?) of the miñti, who lies here.

- 107a.1 [e]beli:mē ti siyēni:tele:se lada:se tideime:ehbi:∠:
sladāi:ebttehi:ll
Here lies Tele and (his) wife and his 5(?) sons and
their 4(?) wives.

- 111.1-4 ebēññē:khupā:me ti:prñnawat[ē] erzesinube:kumaza:
tr[zzuba[h....] tāti:ebññē:ebe:tiye:h<r>ppi [tā]ti
tike:ebe:etleh[i]:[s]e [kbiyehi] me ttlidi:kbišñtāta:
āmmām:glebi:kerut[i]:e[.....] se ttlidi:trzzubi:āmmāma:
kbišñtatā:uwa:

638, n.2), Korol'ov and Ševoroškin: *kūma sñta* - 50 (1969, 524, n.2). None of these interpretations are at all certain, and the values that have been assigned may in most cases be far too high, especially when one considers their practical implications in the penalty clauses. For instance, in TL 102 it seems unrealistic to think in terms of a fine of 800, or even 80, cattle to compensate for unauthorised use of a tomb. Carruba in fact argues for much smaller values, interpreting *sñta* as 1, *kbišñtāta* as 2, *aitāta* as 8, and *nuñtāta* as 9 (1974, 583-92). His arguments are plausible but not conclusive, and one must accept that the Lycian numerals when expressed alphabetically are still unknown quantities.

88. The interpretation of *āmmāma* as "fine" or "penalty" accords with the suggestion of Kishimoto (1965, 283ff.). Other scholars however construe *āmmāma* as an adjective qualifying *uwa* ("cattle"). Neumann suggests that it may be a Lycianised form of ἀμμος ("unblemished") - a Greek word taken over into Lycian (1974, 110). Carruba suggests that it is the Lycian word meaning "young" (1974, 581, n.8), a suggestion adopted by Heubeck (1982, 114-15).
89. On the meaning of *pñtreñni*, see Bryce, 1981a, 82-83. To the references contained therein add Frei, 1981, 362.
90. Neumann interprets *khba* as the name of a deity; see below, Chapter 6, p. 189.
91. On the term *pddēnehñmi*, see below, Chapter 5, p. 135.
92. *khupa* is apparently used here in the dat. case to refer to a chamber within the tomb rather than to the tomb as a whole (as also in TL 131.2)

This tomb Erzesinube, priest of Trzzbi, has built (it). (And) they will place (within) this (person) there. Who(ever) places anyone (else) upon him there, from his own and (= or?) from another (family) will pay *kbišñtāta*⁹³ cattle as penalty(?) to the sanctuary(?) here *kerut[i]:e[.....]* and will pay *kbišñtāta* cattle as penalty to Trzzubi.

- 114 esedeplēme:me:adē:tesi:miñti awahai:khupa:ehbi:sei
ne:epñ:puñtē mei:[a]wahi:tesi:aladahali -)
With Esedeplēmi the miñti has made an agreement(?)
for-the-purpose-of burial(?)⁹⁴ in his tomb. And they
have subsequently admitted him. The agreement for the
arranging/preparing for-the-purpose-of burial(?) (is)
-) (adas).

- 117 ebeiya:erawaziya:me ti:prñnawatē:sideriya:parm[ēnah]:
tideimi [h]rppi:etli se ladi:ehbi:se tideimi:
pubieleye
τὸ μνημα τὸδ'ἐποιήσατο Σιδάριος Παρμένοντος υἱὸς αὐτοῦ
καὶ τῆς γυν[α]κὸς καὶ υἱῶν Πυβιάδην.
This heroon(?) Sideriya, son of Parmēna, has built (it)
for himself and his wife and (his) son Pubiele.

- 118.1-2 [ebē]ññē:[.]tisēni:me ti:prñnawatē:khuñniyēi:masasahe:
tideimi:hrzzi:ñtat[ā] khuñniyeye:s[e] ladi:[ehb]i:se
uwe ni:hrppi:tatu:tike
This [.]tisēni Khuñniyēi, son of Masasa/i, has built
(it), the upper chamber for Khuñniyēi and his wife.
And one may not place anyone (else) uwe⁹⁵ upon (them).

- 121 ebēññē khupā me ti prñnawatē erñmenēni:se lada ehbi

93. On *kbišñtāta*, see above, n.87.

94. On the interpretation of *awahai/awahi* as "for the purpose of burial", see Houwink ten Cate, 1965, n. b on TL 16.

95. *uwe* is, perhaps, a particle meaning "further", "in addition". Cf. Houwink ten Cate, 1965, 79-80, par. 24.

hrppi atla eptte se prñezi epttehi

This tomb Erñmenēni and his wife have (lit. has) built (it) for themselves and their household.

- 124 ebēñē khupu sei hri ti ñtipa me ti adē uhētēi e[[b]]behi
ñtatā sebei[y]es kñmis itei ladi tideime ehbiye O
This tomb and the sculpture (inscription?) that is here on (it), Uhētēi has made (it), the apartment of it and these kñmis for Itei(?), (his) wife and his 10(?) children (translated by Houwink ten Cate, 1965, 97).

- 131 [.....]a [t]i [pr]ñnawate:hrppi ladi:ehbi:me ne:ñtepi
tāti:ebññē:se ladā:ehbi:[...]eruma[.]u se khawarttu:
se iye ti:eseri tadi:tike khupa:ebēhi:tibe te:alahadi:
[tik]e tiye:se khttadi:tike hruttla:ebēiya:me ttidi:
ēni qlahi:ebiyehi nuñtāta:añm[ā]ma:uwa se niyepi:zalatu:
se ttiti ēni qlahi:ebiyehi:rñmazata:kh[ā]ase:adā:Δ.sewe
trbbalahati:tawa
[.....]a has built (it) for his wife. And they will place him, this (person), within and his wife [....]eruma[.]u se khawarttu. And who(ever) places anyone (else) with them in the chamber of this (tomb) or lays out(??) anyone (else) there, and who(ever) erases/alters⁹⁶ this inscription/these instructions(??) will pay nuñtāta cattle as a penalty to the mother of

96. The Lycian verb is *khttadi*, which occurs again in the Lycian version of the trilingual (lines 34-35) where it corresponds to μετακινήσειν in the Greek version (lines 34-35). The precise meaning of the verb is not altogether certain, although in the contexts referred to here, it does seem to have the sense of modifying/altering/erasing the text of an inscription (cf. Robert, 1974, 291, Bryce, 1978-79, 123-24, Laroche, 1979b, 74, Metzger, 1979, 39, Frei, 1981, 357-58). We might compare a number of the Greek inscriptions of Lycia where the erasure of an inscription, or additions to it, are specifically referred to as violations (e.g. TAM II 247.8, 357.9-12, 622.3-4, 797.11-13, SEG IV 765).

this sanctuary(?) se niyepi:zalatu⁹⁷ and he will pay to the mother of this sanctuary(?) 5 adas of grain(?)⁹⁸ monthly sewe trbbalahati:tawa.⁹⁹

- 138 ebēññē:khupā:me ti prñnawatē:uwihairi kbatri:ehbi:
plezziyeheye
This tomb Uwihairi has built (it) for his daughter Plezziyehi(?).

- 139 ebēñē:khupa mē ti prñna[wat]ē tilume:zizahāmah tideimi
hrppi ladi ehbi:khukhune ye se tideime ehbiy[e] se uwe:
ti hrppi tāti tike me ne tubidi h[p]ñnte[rus] mähāi:se
maraziya miñtaha:hlñmidewe:mleyeusi murñna
This tomb Tilume, son of Zizahāma, has built (it) for his wife Khukhuni and his children. And (those) who place anyone (else) upon (them) uwe, the hppñterus gods(??)¹⁰⁰ and the tribunal(?)¹⁰¹ of the miñti will punish them. For Hlñmidewe(?), Mleyeusi(?), and Murñna(?).

- 143 Κοδρας Οσαμπος

97. *zalatu* is probably to be construed as an imperative verb, made negative by *ni*. Neumann suggests that the expression may mean "und er soll (scil. diese Angabe der Rinder) nicht verzögern!" (1974, 114). He compares *zala-* with Hittite *zallaz* and Luwian *zallati-* - "in langsamer Gangart", and suggests that *epi zala-* may correspond to the Latin *re-tardare*.
98. For the suggestion that *kh[ā]ase* is an oblique form of **khad(a)-* and that **khad(a)-* means "grain", see Neumann, 1962, 208, and 1974, 113-14.
99. I would suggest, very tentatively, that *sewe trbbalahati:tawa* may mean "and he (i.e. the offender) will re-arrange(??) (the tomb/the tomb's contents) adequately(??)". In other words, the person who has committed the offence is responsible for restoring the tomb (or its contents) to its original state. Cf. Carruba, 1969, 97 and Ševoroškin, 1969, 270.
100. For the interpretation of *hppñterus mähāi*, see below, Chapter 6, p. 188.
101. "tribunal" is the translation proposed for *maraziya*, a cognate of *mara* which appears in line 33 of the trilingual and means "laws, regulations" (or similar). *maraziya* may then refer to a court of justice, consisting of members of the local *miñti* responsible in this instance for passing judgment on those charged with tomb violation. Cf. Laroche, 1979b, 74, 98, Heubeck, 1982, 110).

ebēññē:ñtatu:mē ti prñnawate:khudara:[hrppi l]adi:ehbi:
ñmiye:se tideime:ehbiye se piy[etē] mlā:ñnazi:ebēññē:
ñtatu:pttlezeyey:se ladi e[h]bi mañmahaye:kbatrī:ehbi:
se tideime:ehbiye

This chamber Khudara has built (it) for his wife ñmi
and his children. And (the(?)) Mlāñnazi¹⁰² has allocated
this chamber to Pttlezēi(?) and his wife Mañmaha, his
daughter and his sons.

149. ebēññē:prñnawā me ne prñnawatē iyamara:terssikhlehe.¹⁰³
1-10 tideimi maliyahi:wedrēññehi:akh[[s]]ātaza:me pibiyeti
prñnezi:se tteri:adaiyē mei ne ñta wātā pibiyeti:tere
ebēñ me iye ne:hrppi tāti tike:iyamaraye:tibe:ladi:
ehbi:hrpp[īye mei] tadi tike:kbi:ti[b]e khttbadi:ēti:
prñn[eziyehi] kbiyehi:tike:me httēmi:ānabayē:se
n[.....] wedrēññi:āñmāma kñma sñta:wawā:se k[.....]
khawā:sē ne:tesēti:qāñti:trñmiliyēt:i
This building Iyamara, son of Terssikhle, priest¹⁰⁴
of the regional Maliya, has built it, and he allocates
(it) to (his) household se tteri:adaiyē mei ne ñta wātā
me pibiyeti¹⁰⁵:tere ebēñ. And they will not place
anyone (else) upon them, upon Iyamara or his wife. If
(someone) places anyone else upon them, or commits an
offence(?) ēti anyone of another household, he (will
be) responsible(?) anabayē. And [...] the regional
[...] kñma sñta cattle and k[.....] sheep as a
penalty(?); and the Lycian oath-gods will pass
judgment upon him.

102. It is uncertain whether Mlāñnazi is an official title or
a personal name.
103. In the original text the name Terssikhleh- ends with the
symbol ◊, which should probably be transcribed purely as
a vowel after the preceding aspirate; see above, n.30.
104. On the term akhātaza, ("priest"), see below, Chapter 5, p. 132.
105. Houwink ten Cate translates mei ... pibiyeti as "and he gives
not the right to be buried(?) here" (1965, 98). On the forms
pibiti, pibiyeti, see also Heubeck, 1981, 166-67.

- 150 ebeli:me siyēni:khssēñziya:khñtlapah:tideimi:mutleh:
prñneziyehi:prñnawate ti:ñtatā:atli:ehbi:se iye ne:
hrppi tāti:tike:kbi:hrppiye mei:tā[t]i:me ne:qastti:
maliya:wedrēññi:se itlehi:trñmili huwedri:khssēñziyaye:
hberuse zasāni:khadrñna:uhazata:kumezeine
Here lies Khssēñziya, son of Khñtlapa, member-of-the-
household of Mutla/i, who has built the chamber for
himself. They will not place anyone else upon him.
If they place (anyone else) upon him, the regional
Maliya and the huwedri Lycian itlehi will pass judgment
upon them (i.e. the offenders). For Khssēñziya hberuse
zasāni:khadrñna to make yearly sacrifice.

- N 306 ebēñ[n]ē:prñnaw[ā]:mēti prñnawatē:piñteusi:tewinaza:
idazzalah:tideimi:hrppi:ladi:ehbi:setideime:ehbiye:
[m]ene:ñtepiñtāti:hrzzi:prñnawi:piñteusi:selañā:ehbi:
kbi:tike:meñte ne:hriyalahadi:tike:atlahi:tibekbiyehi:
hriñtemei:alahadi:tike:atlahi:tibekbiyehi:mei:māñāi:
htteñ:lātāi:seheledi:seneitlehi:qāñti:trñmili:huwedri
This building Piñteusi, tewinaza, son of Idazzala, has
built (it) for his wife and his children. (And) they
will place him within, Piñteusi and his wife, in the
upper building. One will not arrange/lay out(??) anyone
else on top inside, anyone of his own or another's (family).
If one arranges/lays out(??) anyone on top inside, (either)
of his own or another's (family), he (i.e. the offender)
will be responsible to the gods lātāi seheledi,¹⁰⁶ and
the huwedri Lycian itlehi will pass judgment upon him.

- 310 ebēññē:khup[ā:m]ēne:prñnawatē khlasitini:magabatah:
tideimi khali:gehñniteti:ebēññē: ē[nē]:arppakhuhe:
khñt[aw]ata
This tomb Khlasitini, son of Magabata, who has purchased(??)

106. For the suggestion that lātāi and heledi are the names of
deities, see Neumann, 1979, 25, and see below, 189.

this place(?),¹⁰⁷ has built it. Under the command of Arppakhu (= Harpagos).

- 322 ebēñnē:khupā:mēne:prñnawa[t]ē[.]jazz[.]pēmudiyah:tideimi:
qelehi:kumaza [h]rppi:ladi:setideime:aladahali:ada ||
This tomb [.]jazz[.], son of Pēmudiya, sacrificial priest of Qeli, has built it for (his) wife and children. For the (burial) arrangements(?), 2 adas.

* * * * *

107. The translation "who has purchased(?) this place(?)" is based on Neumann's interpretation of *khali:gehñniteti* - "der diesen Platz(?) gemietet (gekauft? gepachtet?) hat" (1979b, 27). See also Bryce, 1981b, 229.

B. The non-sepulchral inscriptions

The great majority of the non-sepulchral epichoric inscriptions are largely unintelligible, and in very few cases are we able to translate more than a few scattered words and phrases in them. Broadly speaking, the non-sepulchral inscriptions can be categorised as follows:

- (a) inscriptions on monuments commemorating a person or family - TL 25, 27, 28, 51, 54.
- (b) inscriptions dealing with religious rites - TL 26(?),¹⁰⁸ 65(?), N 304, 320.
- (c) an administrative decree - TL 45.
- (d) religious dedications - N 311, 312, 318, N Suppls. 1, 3, 4.
- (e) the Xanthos stele inscription (TL 44), a record of military activities and achievements, and religious practices.¹⁰⁹
- (f) inscriptions of uncertain classification - TL 24, 35, 55, N 319, N Suppl. 2.

Of these inscriptions we can offer reasonably complete translations of the following:

108. Although fragmentary and largely obscure, the inscription contains various references to the gods (lines 9 and 22), in particular Trqqas (lines 7 and 18), to a *qla* (sanctuary?) (lines 3, 8, 17, 24), to a priest (line 20), and to a monthly sacrifice (line 16). Note Neumann's discussion of the inscription, 1976, 83-86.

109. The text and translation of the Greek epigram appearing on side c of the stele appear below under D. The text with a brief commentary appears also in Hansen, 1983, 97.

TL 25(a) (inscription on a statue base):
 ebeis:tukedris:m[e ne]¹¹⁰ tuwetē:khssbezē:¹¹¹
 krup[sseh] tideimi:se purihime[teh] tuhes:
 tlāñna:atru:ehb[i] se ladu:ehbi:tikeukēprē
 pilleñni:urtaqiyahñ:kbatru se priyenubehñ:
 tuhesñ
 Πόρπαξ θρύπιος Πυριβάτους ἀδελφιδούς Τλωεύς
 ἑαυτὸν κα[ί] τῆς γυναῖκα Τισευσέμβραν ἐκ
 Πινάρων Ὀρτανία θυγατέρ<α> Πριανόβα
 ἀδελφιδῶν Ἀπόλλωνι
 Khssebezē, son of Kruppsi, nephew of Purihimeti, citizen
 of Tlos, erected these statues (representing) himself
 and his wife Tikeukēpre, citizen of Pinara, daughter
 of Urtaqiya, niece of Priyenuba.

27 (inscription on a stele):
 mekhisttēñ:¹¹² ep[ñ]¹¹³ tuwete:atli:ehbi:
 skhkhuliyah:tideimi:sa ladi:ehbi:merimaway[e]
 petēñneh:tideimi:se tideimi ehbi:skhkhuliye
 Mekhistte, son of Skhkhuliya, has erected (it) for
 himself and his wife Merimawa, offspring of Petēñni,
 and his son Skhkhuliya.

110. An additional restoration to Friedrich's text.

111. Khssbezē, the name of the tomb owner, corresponds to Πόρπαξ in the Greek version. Πόρπαξ is obviously not a Greek transcription of the Lycian name, but it may be a translation of it. As an ordinary noun πόρπαξ is the term used for the handle of a shield, and this may in fact indicate the meaning of khssbezē in Lycian.

112. On the (ē)ne ending, see Carruba's comments, 1978, 76-78.

113. An additional restoration to Friedrich's text.

N 320 (the Letoon trilingual). The full text of the trilingual, with French translations and commentaries, has most recently been published in *Fouilles de Xanthos VI*, and we shall confine ourselves here to the epichoric version of the inscription:

1. ēke:trñmisñ:khssaðrapazate:pig-
2. esere:katamlah:tideimi:sēññēn-
3. tepddēhadē:trñmile:pddēnehñm-
4. is:iyeru:senatrbbiyēmi:seyarñ-
5. na:asakhlazu:erttimeli:mehñtit-
6. ubedē:arus:seyepewētñmēi:arñ-
7. nāi:ñmaitē:kumeziye:ððē:khñtawa-
8. ti:khbidēñni:seyar??azuma¹¹⁴:khñta-
9. wati:sēññaitē:kumazu:mahāna:eb-
10. ette:eseimiyu:qñturahahñ:tide-
11. imi:sede:eseimiyaye:khuwatiti:s-
12. eipiyētē:arawā:ehbiyē:esiti:se-
13. deliñtāte:teteri:seyepewētñm-
14. mēi:hrñmada:ttaraha:mekhbaitē:z-
15. ā:esekhesñtedi:qñtati:sepigrēi:
16. sēñteñtekñmē:seyēti:ððē:sttat-
17. iteli:setahñtāi:khñtawatehi:khb-
18. idēñnehi:seyar??azumahi:seip-
19. ibiti:uhazata:ada: 𐌶𐌶𐌶 :ēti:ttla-
20. khñta:arñna:sesñmāti:khddazas:ep-
21. ide:arawa:hātikñmētis:meipibi-
22. ti:sikhlas:sewayaitē:kumaha:ēti
23. sttali:ppuweti:kñmē:ebhi:khñta-
24. wataha:khbidēñnaha:ser??azuma-
25. ha:meiyesitēñiti:hñmñpiyata
26. medetewē:kumezidi:nuredi:nure-
27. di:arā:kumehedi:seuhazata:uwad-
28. i:khñawati:khbidēñni:seyar??az-
29. uma:mekumezidi:seimiya:sede:se-

114. The question marks represent the symbol /w (used twice), referred to above, p. 57 n.20, perhaps a Carian symbol, roughly equivalent to the Greek kappa; see again Laroche, 1979b, 57.

30. imiyaye:khuwatiti:seiyehbiyai-
31. tē:tasa:mere:ebette:teteri:arñn-
32. as:seyepewētłmmēi:arnñai:mete-
33. pituwēti:mara ebeiya:ēti sttal-
34. i:ppuwētime:ebehi:sewene:khtta-
35. i:tike:ebineñtewe:mahāna:ebett-
36. e:ebine:ñtewē:kumazi:ebehi:khtta-
37. demeyē:tike:mepddē:mahāna:sñma-
38. ti:ebette:seyēni:qlahi:ebiyehi
39. pñtrēñni:setideime:ehbiye:sey-
40. eliyāna:pigesereye:meiyeseri-
41. hhati:mehriqla:asñne:pzzititi

- 1-9: When Pigesere (= Pixodaros), son of Katamla (= Hekatomnos), was satrap of Trñmisa (= Lycia) and appointed Iera and Natrbbiyēmi¹¹⁵ commissioners for the Trñmili (= Lycians), and Erttimeli as governor¹¹⁶ of Arñna (= Xanthos), the citizens and perioikoi¹¹⁷ of Arñna determined to establish an altar for the Lord of Kaunos and for the Lord Arkazuma.¹¹⁸
- 9-18: And they made Eseimiya (= Simias), son of Qñturaha, priest for these gods, and (subsequently) whoever succeeds Eseimiya; and they gave to him/them exemption from property dues; and there the townspeople and perioikoi set aside(?) property belonging to the town; (and they) resumed(?) (the land) which Khesñtedi and Pigrēi till; and whatever is erected and attached(?) there (will become the property?) of the Lord of Kaunos and Arkazuma.

115. For the possible implications of the equation between Natrbbiyēmi in the Lycian text and Apollodotos in the Greek, see below, Chapter 6, pp. 187-88.

116. The Lycian term is asakhlaza, which is equated with ἐκουμελητής in the Greek text.

117. The possible implications of this term are discussed below, Chapter 5, pp. 169-71.

118. On the transcription of the proper name, see Laroche, 1979b, 57.

- 18-22: And Arñna will give each year x¹¹⁹ adas (as) payment and will be responsible(?) (for ensuring that)¹²⁰ all slaves¹²¹ who are subsequently enfranchised there will give shekels (one shekel apiece?).
- 22-25: And they further made all that is inscribed(?) on this stele sacred to the Lord of Kaunos and to Arkazuma.
- 25-30: (And from) whatever tribute(?) is gathered(???) here medetewē(?) one will duly make sacrifice monthly with a victim, and yearly with an ox to the Lord of Kaunos, and to Arkazuma; (and) Seimiya (is the one who) will make sacrifice and (subsequently) whoever succeeds Seimiya.
- 30-35: And the townspeople of Arñna and the perioikoi of Arñna made an oath for these regulations, and they set up all these regulations that are inscribed(?) on this stele; and furthermore one will not remove (i.e. erase? alter?) anything herewithin (pertaining) either to these gods or to this priest.
- 36-40: Whoever removes (i.e. erases? alters?) anything will be answerable before these gods and the pñtrēñni mother of this sanctuary(?) and her children and the nymphs.
- 40-41: Unintelligible¹²²

119. The interpretation of the numeral associated with ada here has been referred to above, pp. 62-63.

120. Cf. Eichner, 1983, 54-55, with n. 45.

121. The interpretation of khddaza as "slave" seems now to be widely accepted, see most recently Eichner, 1983, 54-59

122. See Laroche's analysis, 1979b, 76, and cf. Frei, 1981, 362-63.

C. The Erbbina inscriptions¹²³

During the course of the French excavations at the Letoon, two statue bases were unearthed bearing inscriptions, both Lycian and Greek, which were composed on the orders of Erbbina, one of the last members of the ruling dynasty at Xanthos (see Chapter 4, pp. 110-11). For convenience' sake, we shall refer to these inscriptions as *Erbbina I* and *Erbbina II*.

Erbbina I, a dedicatory inscription referring to Artemis as the recipient of a bronze statue set up by Erbbina, consists of 2 lines of Lycian followed by an 8-line Greek epigram, imperfectly preserved (published by Bousquet, 1975, 141-42). The Lycian text has most recently been published by Neumann as *N 311*, and reads as follows:

[er]binayēne ubete khruwata ertēmi [kher]igah tideimi
seyupēneh

Erbbina, son of Kheriga and Upēni, has dedicated it (as) an offering to Ertēmi (= Artemis).

The right hand side of the Greek epigram has disappeared, but has been conjecturally restored by Bousquet as follows:

Γέργυλος. ὣν υἱὸς τ[οῦ] Ἀρπάγου ἐκγεγαῶτος?],
"Ἀρτεμι θηροφώνα, [σοὺ μ' ἀνέθηκε, θεά?],
Ἐάνθον καὶ Τελεμ[ησσὸν] ὁ πέρσας ἡδὲ Πίναρα]
'Αρβίνας Λυκίων [κλεινότατος βασιλεύς?],
ἔργων καλλίστων [κλέος ἀράμενος καὶ ἀπάσης]
εὔδος καὶ ψυχὴν [ἔξοχος ἡλικίας?].

Παιδοτρίβας ΕΠ []
δῶρ' ἐποίησε ἐλ[εγήλια] 'Αρβίναυ ἥς σοφίας?].

The restorations proposed by Bousquet are obviously open to question. But enough of the text survives to indicate that while the statue is dedicated to Artemis the huntress (θηροφόνος), the inscription

123. These inscriptions are discussed at some length by Asheri; 1983, 97-104.

is concerned primarily with commemorating the military exploits of Erbbina (in particular, his conquest of Xanthos, Telmessos, and Pinara¹²⁴) and extolling his personal qualities and accomplishments. The inscription concludes with a reference to a pedotribe, apparently the composer of the inscription.

Erbbina II is one of four inscriptions appearing on the statue base unearthed by the French during their 1973 excavations at the Letoon and referred to above (p. 43-44) as part of N Suppl. 1. As I have already noted, the inscriptions on sides B-D have not yet been published, but on the basis of advance information provided by Metzger (1979, 24-25), the Greek inscription on side B credits Erbbina with the building of a temple of Leto. *Erbbina II*, the inscription on side A, is in the form of an elegy composed by Symmachos of Pellana, and indicates that the statue was set up by Erbbina in honour of Leto. The inscription has been published by Bousquet, 1975, 143-148.

[Ἄνθετό με 'Αρβίν]ας παῦς Γέργ[υλος, ἔργα τελέσσας?]
[ἄξια τῆς προγόνων] ἀρετῆς, οὗ νεκ[ρὸν] ἔνεστι?]
[σῶμα σορῶν, στήλη] δὲ ἥδε ἔστι μνημα θ[εῶσθαυ]
4 [ὥς Λυκίους? ἄρ]ξας συνέσει δυνάσει τε κ[ρατίστῃ]
ἄρ[χῇ] ἐφ' ἡλικίας πέρσας ἐμ μηνὶ τρία ἄσ[τη]
Ἐάνθον τε ἡδὲ Πίναρα καὶ εὐλίμενον Τελ[εμησσόν]
πολλοῦτον Λυκίοισι φόβον παρέχων ἐτυρά[ννευ].
8 Τῶν μνημεῶν ἀνέθηκε θεοῦ φραδαῖ 'Απόλλ[ωνος].
Πυθῶν ἐρωτήσας Λητῶν με ἀνέθηκεν ἑαυτο[ῦ]
εἰκόνα, τῶν δὲ ἔργων τὸ σχῆμα ἐπιδείκνυ[ται] ἀλήην].
Κτείνας γὰρ πολλός, πατέρα εὐκλείσας τὸν Γ[έργυλν],
12 πολλὰ μὲν ἄστεα ἔπερσε, καλὸν δὲ κλέος κ[ατὰ] πᾶσαν]
γῆν 'Ασίαν 'Αρβίνας ἑαυτῷ προγόνους τε λέλοιπε,
πάντα ἐμ πᾶσι κρέπων ὅσαπερ σοφοὶ ἄνδρες ἔ[σασιν],
τοξοοῦντι τε ἀρετῇ τε, ἔπικων τε διώγματα εἰδ[ώως]
16 Εἰς τέλος ἐξ ἀρχῆς, 'Αρβίνα, μεγάλα ἔργα Τελ[έσσας]
ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖς μεχαριμμένα (!) δῶρα δ[έδωκας].

124. Bousquet's restoration of Pinara in line 3 is based on the grouping of Xanthos, Pinara, and Telmessos in the *Erbbina II* inscription (line 6).

Σύμμαχος Εὐμήδεος Πελλανεύς μάντις ἀ[μύμων]
δῶρον ἔτευξε ἐλεγίῃα Ἀρβίναί εὐσυνέτως.

[Arbin]as, son of Gerg[is] (= Kheriga), [dedicated me, having accomplished deeds worthy of the] valour [of his forefathers]. [Within the tomb chamber lies] (his) cor[pse]. But the stele [that one] s[ees] here commemorates (4) how he est[ablished his rule over the Lycians] by his resourcefulness, his s[upreme] might and po[wer]. In his youth he conquered in one month three cities - Xanthos, Pinara, and Tel[messos] with its fine harbour - striking terror into many Lycians and becoming their mas[ter]. (8) A monument to these (achievements) he set up on the advice of the god Apoll[o]. Having sought counsel at Pytho, he dedicated me to Leto - his own image, whose *outward appearance*(??) expres[ses the prowess?] of his achievements.¹²⁵ Having slain many people, having brought honour to his father G[ergis], (12) having conquered many cities, Arbinas made his own and his forefathers' name renowned [through the whole] land of Asia. He was conspicuous amongst all in all human wisdom, in bowmanship, in courage, in horsemanship. (16) From beginning to end, Arbinas, [you have] acc[omplished] great deeds, [you have presented] pleasing gifts to the immortal gods.

(18) Symmachos of Pellana, son of Eumedes, seer w[ithout reproach], skilfully produced (this) elegy as a gift for Arbinas.

125. The interpretation of line 10, along with the restoration ἀλκήν at the end of the line is open to question. But Robert's assumption that σχῆμα (the statue's 'outward appearance') refers to relief sculptures depicting the various exploits (τὰ ἔργα) of Erbbina seems a reasonable one (1978, 5 n. 2).

D. The Greek epigram in the Xanthos stele inscription (TL 44 c 20-31)

- 20 [Ἐ]ξ οὗ τ' Εὐρώπην [Ἀ]σίας δίχῃα πόντος ἔνε[μ]ε[ν],
- 21 [ο]ύδ' ἔς πω Λυκίων στήλην τοιάνδε ἀνέθηκα >ν
- 22 [δ]ώδεκα θεοῦς ἀγορᾶς ἐν καθαρῷ τεμένει.
- 23 [νικ]έων καὶ πολέμου μνημα τόδε ἀθάν<α>τον.
- 24 [Κε]ρ[ρ]υς ὅδε Ἀρπάγου υἱὸς ἀριστεύσας τὰ ἅπαντα
- 25 [χερ]σὶ πάλην Λυκίων τῶν τότε' ἐν ἡλικίαι.
- 26 [πο]λλὰς δὲ ἀκροπόλεις σὺν Ἀθηναίαις πολυπόρῳ
- 27 [π]έρσας συγγενέσιν δῶκε μέρος βασιλείας.
- 28 ὧν χάριν ἀθάνατοὶ οἱ ἀπεμ<ή>σαντο δικαίαν,
- 29 ἐπ' αὖ δὲ ὀπλίτας κτεῖνεν ἐν ἡμέραι Ἀρκάδας ἄνδρας,
- 30 Ζηνὶ δὲ π<λ>έστα τροπαῖα β<ρ>ότων ἔ<σ>[τ]ησεν ἀπαν<τ>ων,
- 31 καλλίστοις δ' ἔργοις Κα[ρ]ίῃα γένος ἔστεφάνωσεν.

(20) Since the time when the ocean separated Europe from Asia, no Lycian has ever yet raised such a stele to the Twelve Gods in the holy temenos of the agora, this immortal monument to his victories in war(?). (24) It was [Κε]ρ[ρ]υς(??),¹²⁶ the son of Harpagos, having excelled in all respects the youth of his day in his prowess at wrestling, who conquered many acropolises with (the support of) Athene, sacker of cities, and distributed part of his kingdom amongst his kin. (28) In

126. The name to be restored here is that of the author of the inscription. In my view Childs has successfully demonstrated that the author is Kherēi, the brother and probably the successor of Kheriga as ruling dynast at Xanthos (see Childs, 1979. The members of the ruling dynasty at Xanthos will be discussed in vol. II.) I am confident that the authorship of the inscription is to be attributed to Kherēi and not to Kheriga as Bousquet (1975, 138-40) and others (e.g. Heubeck, 1979, 253) have supposed. Even so, the precise form of Kherēi's name in Greek remains uncertain, and the restoration [Κε]ρ[ρ]υς is very tentative.

recognition of this, the immortal (gods) made him just recompense. He killed seven Arkadian hoplites in a single day, he who of all mankind set up the most numerous trophies to Zeus and garlanded by his illustrious exploits the family of Karika.¹²⁷

127. Presumably the founder of the dynasty to which the author of the inscription belongs. It may be that Karika is the (or a) Greek form of Kheriga, a name which may well have been borne by several members of the dynastic family. We note, however, from both Erbbina I and II that Kheriga is represented in Greek as Ἐργυς. Is it possible that Karika and Gergis are alternative Greek forms of the Lycian name Kheriga?

4. THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The first historical reference we have to Lycia is Herodotos' claim (1.28) that the Cilicians and the Lycians were the only people unsubdued by the Lydian king Kroisos in his campaigns west of the Halys river¹. Herodotos' statement may indicate that these peoples successfully resisted attempts made by Kroisos to take their countries. On the other hand it may simply mean that, for reasons unknown to us, Kroisos never campaigned against them.

In any case Lycia apparently remained free of foreign control until the campaigns of the Persian commander Harpagos c. 540 B.C. According to Herodotos' account of these campaigns (1.176) Harpagos, after securing or receiving the submission of the seaboard Ionian Greeks and the Carians, proceeded into Lycia where he met and defeated a small Lycian army on the plain lying north of the city of Xanthos. The Lycians withdrew into the city, which was placed under siege by Harpagos. When it became clear to the inhabitants that a Persian victory was inevitable, they destroyed the buildings on the acropolis, slew their wives, children, and slaves, and made one last suicidal attack on Harpagos' troops. The outcome, according to Herodotos, was the total destruction of the population of Xanthos, except for 80 families who were absent at the time,² presumably in mountain pastures. Whether or not the devastation was as complete as Herodotos suggests,³ this one engagement was sufficient to establish Persian authority in the country.

1. We should, however, note a brief attestation by Timachidas (citing Timokritos and Polyzelos) of a Rhodian campaign against Lycia led by Kleoboulos (of Lindos) (Lind. Chron. C. XXIII). If this event, not attested in any of our other sources, did take place, it should probably be dated relatively early in the 6th century B.C., or at least before Kroisos' campaigns in Asia Minor. On Kleoboulos of Lindos, see Diog. Laert. 1. 89.
2. ὅστων in Herodotos' text almost certainly refers to individual family units; cf. Treuber, 1887, 93 (who wrongly gives the number of families as 60).
3. See Demargne and Metzger, 1967, 1381. Cf. the comments of Treuber, 1887, 95. For evidence of the destruction as reflected in the excavations, see Metzger, 1963, 1, 17-18, 31-32, 46-47.

What was the extent of Lycian territory at this time? I have suggested in Chapter 2 that in Homeric times the territory politically identifiable as Lycia was confined essentially to the Xanthos valley. In the period which followed, up to the time of the Persian conquest, there may have been no appreciable change in this situation. We have noted the fragment from Panyasis which suggests that the towns of the Xanthos valley and the region immediately to the west comprised a small group of interrelated settlements - Xanthos, Tlos, Pinara (allegedly founded by colonists from Xanthos), and the as yet unidentified town of Kragos (see above, p. 22). Perhaps it was the area encompassed by these towns to which the term Lycia most particularly applied in the 6th century. Almost certainly Xanthos was the chief settlement in the area, and probably from the foreign invader's point of view the only Lycian settlement of any significance. We note that after his conquest of Caria Harpagos marched directly and apparently without impediment to the plain near Xanthos, and it was only here that the Lycians opposed him. In fact in Herodotos' account the terms Xanthian and Lycian seem to be used almost interchangeably. To conquer Xanthos was to conquer Lycia.

Whether or not other settlements outside the Xanthos valley were in any way attached to or dependent upon Xanthos is uncertain. But there is little doubt that in a political sense the term Lycia was much more limited in its application at the time of the Persian conquest than it was by the end of the 5th century B.C. And if so, then as I suggested in Chapter 2, 'political' Lycia must have been merely one element within a broader cultural zone extending both east and west of the Xanthos valley, and no doubt containing a number of communities with close ethnic and cultural affinities.

At this stage in Lycian history, then, we should probably recognise a distinction between a 'political' Lycia and a 'cultural' Lycia. The latter, which incorporated the former, applied to a region whose inhabitants may have had a strong measure of cultural coherence but little or no sense of an overall common political identity. In this respect the situation in Lycia at this time may have closely paralleled that of the Bronze Age Lukka communities referred to in Chapter 1. From the late 6th century onwards, however, we see a number of political and administrative developments taking place in the country leading to a

more comprehensive organisation until by the end of the 5th century political Lycia and cultural Lycia were virtually co-extensive.

The rebuilding and repopulation of Xanthos which followed in the wake of Harpagos' victory were probably carried out under Persian auspices. And it was Persian authority, I believe, which provided the initial stimulus for the political and administrative developments which took place in Lycia during the 5th and early 4th centuries.⁴ While for the most part Persian control in Lycia appears to have been very nominal, the Persians must have taken some steps to ensure that the country would henceforth be administered in their interests; and it is more than likely that they provided the basis for a comprehensive administrative system in Lycia designed to give some measure of political and economic coherence to the country as the best means of serving their interests.

In more specific terms, the Persians may have been largely responsible for the establishment (or at least the endorsement) of a ruling dynasty in Xanthos which came to exercise authority through much of central and western Lycia until early in the 4th century B.C. This dynasty may have come to power at least as early as 520 B.C., if we can associate it with the earliest Lycian coins which make their appearance about this time (to be discussed in vol. II).

At all events, the early coinage provides evidence of a recognisable administrative organisation in Lycia by the last quarter of the 6th century, and in 516/15 B.C. Lycia was included amongst the states constituting the first nomos, upon which the Persian king Darius I imposed an annual tribute of 400 talents of silver (*Herodotos* 3. 90). Each member state was presumably responsible for gathering together its own share of the tribute, and this in turn would indicate the existence of some form of centralised administrative organisation in Lycia at this time.

It is unlikely, however, that this development resulted in a lasting or deep-seated unity amongst the Lycian communities as a whole. The unity

4. *I.e. the territory extending from Telmessos in the west to Rhodiapolis in the east, as indicated by the epichoric inscriptions.*

and solidarity for which the country later became noted, as reflected in the operation of the Lycian League, was in my opinion a relatively late development in Lycian history, and very likely grew out of the various political and military circumstances affecting the country in the centuries following the campaigns of Alexander.⁵ The first explicit evidence of the League comes from two inscriptions belonging to the early 2nd century B.C. The first of these, datable to the period 188-81 B.C., refers to certain honours which the League accorded to a Ptolemaic official in the reign of Ptolemy V Epiphanes.⁶ The second is an inscription from Araxa, datable to c. 180 B.C., in honour of Orthagoras, a citizen of Araxa, in which the League appears as 'a vigorous and apparently efficient government; making its own decisions in peace and war....' (Bean, 1948, 54).⁷

Though a detailed discussion of the League falls outside the scope of this work, we should at least note here that it was a development of major importance in Lycian history, giving the Lycians a perhaps unprecedented commonality of purpose, which becomes particularly marked after the battle of Magnesia (190 B.C) when Lycia was assigned to Rhodes by the Roman senate (Appian, *Syr.* 11. 7. 44, Polybius 21. 24. 7-8). Rhodian overlordship weighed heavily on the country as a whole, and the Lycians' success in persuading the senate to restore their independence in 167 B.C. (Polybius, 30. 5. 12, Livy 44. 15. 1) was no doubt one of the early major achievements of a confederation which served the interests of all Lycian communities.

But such a confederation had, in my opinion, no real counterpart in earlier times, especially in the period of the epichoric inscriptions, in spite of A.H.M. Jones' claim to the contrary.⁸ Certainly the network

5. For a discussion of the possible origins of the League, see Larsen, 1945, 71-75, and note Bean's comments, 1948, 54.

6. See Dittenberger, OGIS 99. See also Treuber, 1887, 149-50, Fougères, 1898, 15, Kornemann, 1924 (RE Suppl. IV), 927, Larsen, 1945, 72, von Aulock, 1974, 16.

7. The inscription was discovered by Bean in 1946 and is discussed in detail by him, 1954, 46-56. For later editions and commentaries on the decree, see the references cited by Larsen, 1968, 241, n. 2.

8. There are no firm grounds for Jones' claim that the Lycians very early displayed traces of a vigorous national spirit

of dynastic alliances which developed in the wake of the Persian conquest gave the country the semblance of a relatively unified and coherent political structure in the 5th and early 4th centuries. But political coherence was, I believe, an artificial, Persian-inspired development rather than a natural one, and depended for its maintenance on the authority of the Persian-backed line of dynasts based at Xanthos.

Lycia's close ties to Persia in the early decades of the 5th century are reflected in the Lycian contribution of 50 ships to Xerxes' armada,⁹ a sizable contribution in relation to the likely resources of Lycia at the time. But the Lycian allegiance to Persia was broken for a period during the middle decades of the 5th century when Lycia became a member of the Athenian Confederacy. The shift in allegiance to Athens seems to have occurred initially during the campaigns in south-west Asia Minor by the Athenian commander Kimon. According to Diodoros (11. 60. 4), Kimon secured 'by persuasion' (πέποισας προσελάβετο) the allegiance of Lycia to the Athenian Confederacy prior to the battle of Eurymedon (c. 468 B.C.).

It has been argued that Diodoros' statement indicates a military conquest by Kimon. Demargne and Metzger suggest that the evidence of a second devastation of the Lycian acropolis at Xanthos which is datable to this period may indicate a sack of the city by Kimon's troops.¹⁰ This suggestion while feasible is open to question. In the first place, the so-called Harpy tomb which lies just to the north of the acropolis certainly antedates Kimon's arrival in the area (to be discussed in vol. II), and if his troops did in fact sack the city it is surprising that this

(1971, 96), or the comment by Bean that the Lycians 'had an instinct for union and federation' (1978, 20). For a contrary view see Bryce, 1983a, 32-33. Larsen also speculated on the possibility of a kind of prototype of the League in the epichoric period (1945, 73-74).

9. This is the figure given by Herodotos, 7.92. According to Diodoros, the size of the Lycian contingent was 40 ships (11. 2. 1 and 11. 3. 7).

10. Demargne and Metzger, 1967, 1383, 1386, who date the 'second devastation' to the period 475-70 B.C. For more detailed information on the signs of destruction at Xanthos at this time, see Metzger and Coupel, 1963, 22-23, 24, 26-27, 32-33, 60-61, 68-69, 81.

tomb was left unmolested. Moreover if the devastation of the acropolis was due to enemy attack, we might well expect some reference to this in Diodoros' account of Kimon's 'conquest' of Lycia.

We have no other reference in our literary sources to a sack of Xanthos at this time, again a surprising omission given that the 6th century destruction of the city was noted in later times when it was compared to the 1st century destruction of the city by Brutus (see *Appian, bell. civ. 4. 10. 80*). And a further point to note is that whatever the nature of Kimon's takeover of Lycia, it had no apparent effect on the internal political organisation of the country. Kuprili, the ruling dynast based at Xanthos, continued to hold authority, as illustrated by his coin-issues which continue down to c. 440 B.C., and the system of regional administrators who were probably subject to his authority (to be discussed in vol. II) remained unchanged.

I believe that Diodoros' statement is to be taken at face value, and that the Lycians submitted to Kimon without resistance as an alternative to almost certain military defeat at his hands - at a time when little or no assistance could be expected from Persia. That this alternative was available is clearly implied by Diodoros (following Ephoros), who states that after using either force or persuasion to bring the cities of Caria into the Athenian Confederacy, Kimon likewise won over the Lycians by persuasion. The distinction indicates that a number of the cities of both Caria and Lycia submitted to Kimon without military action. Diodoros' statement might well mean that all the Lycian cities submitted in this way; indeed the only city in the region for which we have evidence of military conquest is Phaselis, which according to Plutarch (*Kim. 12. 3-4*) was placed under siege by Kimon and taken by force. And at this time Phaselis was not part of Lycian territory.

If the above interpretation of Diodoros' statement is correct, then obviously the destruction of the buildings on the acropolis at Xanthos would have to be attributed to some other form of disaster - perhaps accidental fire or earthquake.

Perhaps because of its peaceful submission, Kimon seems not to have interfered with the internal political system of Lycia, the Athenian takeover simply meaning a shift in the country's political alignment from Persia to Athens. At all events it is likely that Lycia's membership of

the Athenian Confederacy dates from this time, although explicit evidence for its attachment to the Confederacy appears first in the Athenian Tribute List of 452/51 B.C.

On the three occasions on which the Lycians appear in this list (452/1, 451/0, 446/5), they are grouped with the Telmessians.¹¹ The entries on the Lycians are as follows:

list 3	I	29-30	[Τελμέσσοι καὶ Λύκιοι]
list 4	V	32-33	[Τελμέσσοι καὶ Λύκιοι]
list 9	III	33-34	Τελμέσσοι Λύκιοι: καὶ συν[τελ]

Several interesting points emerge from these entries. Firstly it is clear that Telmessos, near the Carian border, did not at this stage belong to Lycian territory in the political sense, but was grouped with it by the Athenians for administrative purposes. Indeed it is not until the final decades of the 5th century, when the Xanthian dynast Kherēi issued coins bearing the name of Telmessos (see Mörkholm and Zahle, 1976, 52, nos. 50-54), that we have any clear indication that Telmessos had become part of Lycia. Similarly other towns and districts which we commonly regard as lying within Lycian territory were probably politically independent of it at the time of Lycia's membership of the Athenian Confederacy. These were most likely covered by the term *syn(teleis)* in the third of the abovementioned lists. That is to say, the *synteleis* may have consisted, in part at least, of communities which were Lycian in a cultural and ethnic sense, but lay outside the more limited region which we have defined as Lycia in a political sense.¹²

11. These lists appear in *ATL II. On the restorations*, see *ATL III*, p. 7. Jones (1971, 97) mentions only the third of the lists.

12. Cf. Childs' suggestion that the term 'may indicate a grouping of various entities within the area called Lycia or an area "Lycia" to which other units were attached for administrative reasons' (1981, 57). There is nothing to indicate that these communities were not ethnically Lycian, as Jones assumes (1971, 97), although it is of course possible that the *synteleis* also included non-Lycian communities.

Conceivably such communities were located both west of the Xanthos valley as far as (but not including) Telmessos¹³ as well as east of the valley.¹⁴ This explanation is, I believe, to be preferred to the suggestion that the term *synteleis* represents a division within Lycian society and perhaps reflects a distinction between citizens and *perioikoi*/*epewētīmēi*, as referred to in the Letoon trilingual.¹⁵ The distinction between citizenry and *perioikoi* was almost certainly a purely internal matter, of little or no direct concern to Lycia's external overlords.¹⁶

At all events, in the 5th century B.C. the territory of Lycia proper was clearly more limited than it was in post-Classical times when it extended from Telmessos in the west to Phaselis in the east.¹⁷

The size of the contribution assessed for the Lycians and the *synteleis* - 10 talents - was a relatively modest one¹⁸ - and was probably deliberately intended as such. The importance of Lycia to

13. As Jones comments (1971, 97), we cannot be altogether sure whether the Telmessos in question is the Carian Telmessos (near Halikarnassos) or the Telmessos which later in the 5th century was incorporated into Lycian territory.

14. Although not as far east as Phaselis, which was entered separately in the Tribute Lists. It is possible that the Milyas district belonged amongst the *synteleis*. On Milyas and the Milyans, see Herodotos 1. 173 and 7.77.

15. Another suggestion made by Childs (1981, 57).

16. As Hahn notes (1981, 53), the distinction is not acknowledged in the Aramaic version of the trilingual, which is the official version of the satrap's decree. In this version reference is made purely to the citizens of Xanthos (line 16).

17. Note that in the 5th century Phaselis was clearly outside Lycian territory, as reflected in its separate entry in the Athenian Tribute Lists, and probably continued as a member of the Athenian Confederacy after the withdrawal of Lycia. For the list of Phaselitan entries, see ATL I, pp. 434-45.

18. Jones' comment that Lycia's contribution was a comparatively large sum (1971, 97) is hardly justified. On the one hand it must have been very much smaller than its share of the 400 talents of silver imposed by Dareios on the 1st nomos. And on the other hand a comparison of Lycia's assessment with the amounts payable by other members of the Confederacy - in particular, those located in the general vicinity of south-west Asia Minor - demonstrates how light Lycia's financial obligations to the Confederacy were.

Athens, I believe, lay not in the monetary revenue that could be extracted from it, but rather in its strategic location at the entrance of the eastern Mediterranean (discussed below, pp. 204-05); access to the harbours in this region was clearly a matter of considerable importance to the Confederacy. And the Athenians may have assumed that the Lycians were less likely to try to sever their membership of the Confederacy if the monetary obligations imposed upon them were not burdensome and contrasted favourably with their earlier obligations to Persia. In any case, Lycia may have been only a sporadic contributor,¹⁹ and perhaps defaulted regularly on its financial contributions to the Confederacy. If so, Athens may well have chosen not to enforce what were little more than token payments. To do so would have aroused, for little gain, the hostility of the Lycian people, who must have been fully aware of the importance Athens attached to maintaining access to the strategically important harbours of the south-west coast of Asia Minor.

Clearly, Lycia's association with Athens was a desultory one, and very likely all links had been severed by the beginning of the Peloponnesian War at the latest, and perhaps as early as 440 B.C.²⁰ Already in the early years of the war the Lycians seem to have been markedly hostile to Athens, as reflected in their resistance to Melesander and the conflict which resulted in his death (430/29 B.C.) (Thucydides 2. 69).

This episode seems also to be recorded in the Xanthos stele inscription, in the words *trbbēnīmi teβete terñ se milasāñtrā* - 'Trbbēnīmi defeated(?) the army and (= of?) Melesander' (TL 44a 44-45). Several scholars have questioned whether these words do in fact refer to the Thucydidean *strategos*, since they occur immediately before, or within the context of, an account of Lycian involvement in the Dekelean War (413-04 B.C.); in view of this Thompson has suggested that the Melesander of the Lycian inscription must have been a later

19. An observation made in ATL III, p. 210; cf. Childs, 1981, 62, n. 33.

20. Cf. Treuber, 1887, 100, Houwink ten Cate, 1965, 5 and n. 7, Metzger, 1979, 34, Childs, 1981, 62 and n. 33. For the suggestion that the Lycian withdrawal may have been as late as 430 B.C., see Mörholm and Zahle, 1976, 75-76.

namesake of Thucydides' Melesander (1967; see also Childs, 1981, 64). The evidence for Thompson's proposal is a suggested restoration to the record of loans made by the treasurers of Athens in 414/13 B.C. (IG I² 297). Merritt had earlier restored line 3 of the inscription as follows: [..... παρέδομεν στρατηγοῦς ἐς τὰ ἐπὶ Θρακίῃς 'Ευετῆλονι Μελέσῳ[δ]νδρ[ο.] (1932, 88, 90); but in place of this Thompson proposed στρατηγοῦ Μελέσῳ[δ]νδρου, concluding that Melesander was the recipient of funds from the treasurers of Athens in 414/13.²¹

This is an attractive possibility and would certainly bring the Melesander of the Lycian inscription within the compass of the Dekelean War. But we must stress that the name Melesander in the Athenian loan record is heavily restored, and for this reason in particular Thompson's proposition must be regarded as very conjectural. We certainly cannot exclude the possibility that the Thucydidean *strategos* and the Melesander of TL 44 are one and the same. It may well be that the reference in the Lycian inscription is a historical flashback, highlighting an earlier Lycian victory over an Athenian army within the context of an account of Lycian involvement in the Dekelean War. Given the likelihood of Lycia's participation in the Persian alliance with Sparta against Athens at this time (see Childs, 1981, 68), the reference to Melesander's defeat in 430/29 might well be appropriate here. If on the other hand Thompson's proposal is correct, we would have to accept not only the existence of two Melesanders, but also the coincidence of two Melesanders engaging in military conflict with the Lycians and being defeated by them. Such a coincidence is clearly suspect.

Whether or not Lycia immediately reverted to Persian allegiance after breaking from the Athenian Confederacy is not altogether clear. But it is not unlikely that the Xanthian dynasty was amenable to, or indeed actively sought political realignment with Persia in the last decades of the 5th century, a conclusion that can be drawn from the satrapal heads appearing on the coins issued by Kherēi, and the evidence indicating that the satrap Tissaphernes minted coins in Lycia (see n. 24).

21. This hypothesis is supported, in Thompson's view, by the fact that the final loan made by the treasurers in 415/14 B.C. went to the *strategos* ἐν Ἐφ[έσου] (IG² 302, line 69).

As Treuber points out, Persian overlordship was not without its advantages (1887, 101); on the one hand, the local ruler was allowed considerable autonomy within his own sphere of influence, while on the other hand his acknowledged role as a Persian vassal was a confirmation and to some extent a guarantee of his political authority.

Moreover, the Xanthos stele inscription clearly indicates the resumption of a Lycian-Persian alliance during the last decades of the 5th century. Kherēi, the author of the inscription and grandson of Kuprili, was an ally, if not a vassal, of the Ionian satrap Tissaphernes,²² he participated in the suppression of the revolt of Amorges,²³ and he was apparently in close touch with Darius (II) and Artaxerxes (II).²⁴ We can reasonably conclude, then, that close ties existed between Lycia and Persia, or more particularly between the Xanthian dynasty and Persia, in the final decades of the 5th and the early decades of the 4th century.

Unfortunately our sources provide us with little information about events within Lycia itself during this period. No doubt the central ruling dynasty at Xanthos provided a strong measure of stability in the region where it exercised authority, but we should not too readily assume that the country remained politically tranquil throughout the dynasty's existence. We have, for example, a possible indication of rebellion by the army of Tlos in TL 44 a 47,²⁵ and the list of cities appearing in

22. Note the references to Tissaphernes (in the Lycianised form Kizzaprīna/Zisaprīna) in the Xanthos stele inscription: TL 44c 1, 11-12, 14, 15. These references appear in what is apparently a religious context.

23. Amorges appears in TL 44 a 55 (in the Lycianised form Humrkhkha) in a context which apparently ties in with the events recorded by Thucydides, 8.28; cf. Childs, 1981, 64.

24. See Childs, 1981, 66-68, and Bryce, 1983a, 36, with nn. 42-45. The closeness of Lycia's ties with the Persian administration at this time is further indicated by a recently published coin bearing the name Tissaphernes in Lycian characters; see Hurter, 1979, 100. The coin (M 221) bears the name Arīna on its obverse, and was therefore issued at Xanthos. The fact that Tissaphernes actually minted in Lycia seems clearly to indicate that at this time the country was at least nominally subject to the authority of the Ionian satrap. See also Zahle, 1979, 103.

25. The relevant words are Kherēi qastte terñ tlahñ, which can perhaps be translated 'Kherēi disciplined(?) the army of Tlos'.

TL 44 b 30 (Xanthos, Pinara, and Tlos) may also be an indication of military activity in the country, as Childs suggests, though the context in which this list occurs is at present unintelligible to us.

There were certainly conflicts in western Lycia during the early decades of the 4th century, as indicated by Erbbina's military engagements with the cities of Xanthos, Pinara, and Telmessos.²⁶ Quite possibly these conflicts represented attempts to break away from or overthrow the authority of the central dynasty. If so, Erbbina was apparently successful in re-establishing control by military force; but the very fact that he was obliged to resort to force suggests a marked degree of fragmentation and unrest amongst the western Lycian cities in this period.

Robert suggests, mainly on the basis of topographical considerations, that Erbbina may have mounted his campaigns against the rebellious cities from Tlos, arguing against Bousquet's suggestion that Kaunos was his base of operations (1978, 18. Cf. Bousquet 1975, 145).²⁷ In Tlos, perhaps, he had been installed as a regional administrator while his father Kheriga or his uncle Kherēi occupied the dynastic seat at Xanthos. But in spite of the apparent success of his campaigns, his sphere of authority seems to have been more limited than that of his predecessors at Xanthos, as indicated by his coin issues which are known only from Telmessos. In contrast to Kuprili, Kheriga, and Kherēi, he did not mint at Xanthos, nor in any of the cities east of the Xanthos valley. Yet the votive inscriptions which he set up in the Letoon (see above, pp. 94-96) indicate that he did in fact exercise authority at least as far east as the Xanthos valley, if not beyond it.

How then do we explain the fact that his coins were minted at Telmessos? Did he use one city, Xanthos, as his administrative centre while issuing his coins exclusively from another? We cannot prove that

26. Recorded in the inscriptions Erbbina I, line 3 and Erbbina II, lines 5-6. (see above, pp. 94-96).

27. Robert's suggestion is based mainly on topographical considerations, but also on the fact that Tlos is not mentioned amongst the cities conquered by Erbbina; this might indicate that Tlos was Erbbina's headquarters, his point of departure (see Robert, REG 89, 1976, 550, no. 661, and 1978, 21).

this was not the case. But we must admit the possibility that Telmessos actually became the seat of his administration. If so, then we would have to assume that circumstances in Lycia at the time made it politically and administratively expedient for him to establish his seat there.

It is possible, then, that under Erbbina there was a shift of the administrative centre of gravity westwards, accompanied probably by a temporary decline in the importance of Xanthos, which may have facilitated in its turn a growing rift between the western and eastern parts of the country. And it may well be that what influence Erbbina possessed in Lycia did not extend east of the Xanthos valley.

While we do not have any explicit information about Erbbina's political sympathies, the west probably remained firm in its Persian allegiance, perhaps until not long before Lycia's participation in the satrap rebellion. This is indicated, for example, by TL 40, the inscription on the so-called Payawa sarcophagos recording a presentation made to Payawa, the builder of the tomb, by the Lydian satrap Autophradates. The inscription indicates continuing Persian influence in the west until at least 370 B.C., the earliest date that can be assigned to the tomb on stylistic grounds (to be discussed in vol. II).

But east of the Xanthos valley a rather different situation emerged. Amongst the local administrators who issued their own coins in eastern Lycia during the early decades of the 4th century, one in particular seems to have developed far-reaching ambitions which were incompatible with a pro-Persian administration in the country - a man called Perikle. Encouraged perhaps by the declining power of the Xanthian dynasty, Perikle appears to have adopted an aggressively independent line. He extended his authority throughout the eastern half of the country, perhaps as far east as Phaselis, and then extended his operations across the Xanthos river in western Lycia where he encountered and defeated Arttūmpara, probably the last of the pro-Persian rulers in the west, and conquered Telmessos.²⁸ Perikle

28. Perikle's defeat of Arttūmpara is recorded in TL 104b (ēke ese Perikle teβete Arttūmparā - 'When Perikle defeated Arttūmpara', or 'When he (i.e. Tebursseli) with(?) (ese)

may well have had before him the vision of a united, independent Lycia, free from the shackles of Persian overlordship. At all events he was almost certainly responsible for, and played a leading role in, Lycia's participation in the satrap rebellion.

It is impossible to be precise about the chronology of Perikle's activities or the events leading up to Lycia's entry into the rebellion. But if we accept the broad limits generally assigned to his career, c. 380-60,²⁹ we must suppose that it was only in the latter part of this career that he began to make his presence felt throughout Lycia. Moreover for some of the period when he apparently held office, Persian influence still extended to the eastern half of Lycia, as indicated by a reference to the Lydian satrap Autophradates in an inscription from Bayindir Liman (TL 61).³⁰

We can assume that on defeating Arttuṃpara and conquering Telmessos, Perikle established Lycia's independence from Persia's control. But we cannot be altogether sure when this took place. We note, however, that c. 370 B.C. Arttuṃpara appears to have been at Side in Pamphylia. This is indicated by a coin minted at Side which bears Arttuṃpara's name, a tetrobol struck on the Persian standard. Atlan dates this coin early in the period of the satrap rebellion and suggests that after his defeat by Perikle Arttuṃpara had gone to live in exile in Side for the duration of the rebellion (1958).³¹ If so, then Lycia must have been freed, or wrested, from Persian authority prior to or in the very early stages of the rebellion. An alternative possibility, suggested

Perikle defeated Arttuṃpara'; cf. Gusmani, 'Zwei kyprische Konjunktion', *Glotta* 44, 1966, 24, n. 2, Neumann, 1969, 391), and his conquest of Telmessos is recorded by Theopompus, ap. Photius, bib. 176, 120a 14-17 (Jac. 115 F 103, 17). See also Bryce, 1980b, 380, and Childs, 1981, 74, who refers in n. 117 to the variety of opinions which have been expressed on the dating of these exploits of Perikle.

29. See the references cited by Childs, 1981, 73, n. 111.

30. In this inscription the name Wataprddate (= Autophradates) appears in the *ēnē...khñtawata* formula. We cannot of course rule out the possibility that the inscription dates to the period after Perikle's career had come to an end and Persian authority once more extended to eastern Lycia.

31. Atlan's proposal is supported by Mörkholm, 1964, 73, and Houwink ten Cate, 1965, 10, n. 1.

by Childs, is that Arttuṃpara may have been sent to Pamphylia with a Lycian contingent by Autophradates, prior to his conflict with Perikle, in order to assist in suppressing the revolt of Datames; and while in Pamphylia Arttuṃpara minted coins to pay his troops. It was subsequent to this, according to Childs, that Arttuṃpara was recalled to Lycia to quash the revolt led by Perikle, but instead suffered defeat at the Lycian leader's hands (1981, 76).

If Childs' explanation is correct, then Perikle's rise to supreme power must have been a late and very rapid development in the Lycian leader's career. This would certainly seem to have been the case if the Payawa sarcophagos is dated much later than 370 B.C. And the fact that he apparently did not issue any coins in the west may be a further indication that the supremacy he had won there was of relatively short duration.

We would be in a better position to reconstruct the career of Perikle if we knew more about Autophradates' role in Lycia,³² and were able to date more precisely the two inscriptions, TL 40 (on the Payawa sarcophagos) and TL 61, which make reference to him. Indeed it is possible that these inscriptions post-date the satrap rebellion and Perikle's career. Perhaps Autophradates himself was responsible for reconquering Lycia, and in the wake of the conquest he may have for a time established his authority more directly in the country than had been the practice in the past for the local satrap. This may explain his appearance in the *ēnē...khñtawata* formula in TL 61. As we shall see, this formula is generally used in connection with rulers/administrators of local origin (pp. 133-34).

In any case, Perikle's career seems to have come to an abrupt end in the rebellion, since we hear no more of him after the Persians regained control in the area.³³ Presumably he would have been one of the

32. On Autophradates in general, see Keil in RE 13, 1927, 2177, s.v. Lydia, Stähelin, RE Suppl. 3, 190, s.v. Autophradates, Judeich, *Kleinasiatische Studien*, Marburg, 1892, 85-100. See also Childs, 1981, 74, n. 119.

33. Houwink ten Cate suggests that he was 'cruelly punished' for his part in the rebellion (1965, 13), but we have no evidence at all of what his eventual fate was. For the suggestion that he may have fled to Strato I of Sidon, see Borchhardt, 1967, 166.

prime targets of the Persian administration if in fact he had been responsible for Lycia's participation in the conflict.

After the collapse of the rebellion, Lycia once more reverted to Persian control, under the immediate authority of the Carian satraps of the Hekatomnid dynasty. In the new arrangements made for Lycia, the system of local dynasts and regional administrators was abandoned, and the country was placed under the immediate authority of a civil administration headed by an ἐπιμελητής (Lyc. *asakhlaza*), and two ἄρχοντες (Lyc. *pddēnehūmis*) residing at Xanthos. While we do not know the precise functions of these officials in Lycia, it seems clear that satrapal control of the country was to be much more direct than in the past. And whether or not the trilingual inscription which contains this information is to be dated to 358 B.C., or as more recently suggested, 337/36 B.C. (see above, pp. 48-49), it seems clear that it reflects a significant tightening up of Persian control over Lycia, via the Hekatomnid dynasty, in the aftermath of Lycia's participation in the satrap rebellion.

This was the political situation in Lycia at the time of Alexander's conquest in 334/33 B.C.

5. CUSTOMS AND INSTITUTIONS

Our knowledge of Lycian society is based very largely on the information provided by the inscriptions which I have discussed and illustrated in chapter 3. While we can hardly claim that these inscriptions present us with a detailed, comprehensive picture of Lycian society during the 5th and 4th centuries B.C., they do provide a significant amount of information on Lycian institutions and offices, on burial practices, and on family relationships. As we have noted, the majority of inscriptions appear on tombs and contain instructions for the disposal of the dead, along with a list of those eligible for interment within a particular tomb. In this respect they are one of the earliest documentary sources on communal burial practices in the Near East, containing as they do detailed information on the nature and composition of the various groups making up the tomb families, and the burial provisions which the tomb owner wishes to be put into effect.

It is quite clear that the tomb owner wished to recreate in death a family environment to be shared by those with whom he had the closest ties in life.¹ On this understanding we can reasonably assume that the inscriptions shed important light on the Lycians themselves, providing information not only about their burial practices, but also about their social customs, their institutions, and their family relationships. My intention in this chapter is to survey the range of information which the inscriptions contain.

I shall be referring on a number of occasions to the later Greek inscriptions of Lycia, particularly the sepulchral inscriptions which contain much more detailed information about local burial practices and the persons making up the tomb families than do the epichoric inscriptions. While the customs and practices attested in Lycia in later times were not always indigenous in origin or current in the epichoric period, nevertheless the marked similarities which exist between the earlier and the later inscriptions do indicate a strong measure of continuity in a number of aspects of Lycian society. In view of this, we

1. For a discussion of the various tomb families, see Bryce, 1979a.

will find it useful to refer to the Greek inscriptions from time to time, partly as a means of illuminating practices and customs for which we have evidence in the epichoric inscriptions, and partly to highlight certain characteristics of Lycian society observable both in the epichoric period as well as in later times.

Burial practices

As we noted in Chapter 3, the most detailed burial instructions contain the following elements: (a) identification of the tomb owner, sometimes by rank or profession as well as by a family designation; (b) a list of persons, or groups of persons, eligible for burial in his tomb; (c) burial arrangements within the tomb; (d) a statement of what is to be regarded as a violation of the owner's instructions, and sometimes the penalty to be inflicted for such violation; (e) the disciplinary agent(s) who will seek redress from the violator; (f) arrangements made with the local *miñti* for the supervision of the tomb; (g) a quasi-dating formula; (h) occasionally, instructions for sacrificial rites in honour of the deceased.

Tomb owners of the 5th and 4th centuries generally provided for the burial only of their wives and children, although on occasions they extended burial rights to other family connections, including servants and retainers. Even so, the average size of the tomb family which seldom ran to double figures,² was small compared with tomb families of the Roman imperial period in Lycia when burial rights were frequently granted to a wide range of relatives, dependants, friends, servants, and slaves (see Bryce, 1979a, 298-312). Given the small area of the tomb chambers and the very restricted accommodation available on the built-in stone couches, limitations of space may originally have been an important consideration in determining the size of the tomb family. Yet in most cases a tomb family of even five or six persons would have caused overcrowding problems if a particular area within the tomb were to be allotted to each person. We would have to assume that fresh

2. Likely exceptions are TL 107a and TL 124, translated above, pp. 82, 84.

interments necessitated the disturbance or removal of earlier burials, or the stacking of the remains on top of each other. Such in fact does seem to have been the fate of human remains in other Near Eastern civilisations where communal burials were practised,³ and may indeed be indicated in a number of the Lycian texts.

This is illustrated by the Lycian practice whereby the tomb owner sometimes set aside an area within his tomb for the exclusive use of himself, and sometimes one or more other privileged occupants. The area so reserved could be a couch, a sarcophagos, or an upper chamber. TL 49 is a case in point:

ebehi:isbazi:mi iye siyēni:padrñma:kumaza:me iye ne
pemati tike:kbi hrppi ttāne:

On the couch of this (tomb) lies/is laid (?) Padrñma, sacrificial priest, and he *does not permit* (??) to place anyone else upon him.⁴

Padrñma claimed sole right to the couch after his death, and his remains were to be left undisturbed. But this did not mean that no other person was to be admitted to his tomb. In fact we know from TL 48a, which appears on the tomb's exterior, that Padrñma also granted the right of interment to a number of his relatives, including nephews/nieces.⁵ Consequently the prohibition applied only to the owner's couch within

3. For brief references, see Bryce, 1980a, 165-66.

4. Cf. Laroche, 1958, 179-80, and Houwink ten Cate, 1965, 92. The inscription appears on the back wall above the kline.

5. In TL 48a, Padrñma (here represented as Padrāma) grants burial rights *nere se tuhe* - 'to (his) *ner-* and (his) nephews/nieces'. *nere* is an emendation made to Kalinka's text ([p]ere) by Friedrich. The form *neri* is found in TL 103. 2. Various translations have been proposed for *neri* - e.g. 'Stiefschwester' (Meriggi, 1930, 423, on the assumption that *nēni* = 'sister'), and 'Geschwisterkind' (Gusmani, 1962, 80-81), 'parent-in-law' (Shafer, 1959, 493-95). Laroche, however, prefers to regard *neri* as the product of a simple dissimilation of *neni* before *tuhes* (1974b, 133). A second inscription on the tomb, designated as TL 48b, may be of slightly later date; see Kalinka, 1901, 51.

the tomb and not to the tomb in general. But the fact that such a clause was necessary is in itself an indication that removal or disturbance of earlier burials was not uncommon practice.

However the tomb owner probably did not expect that all those to whom he granted tenancy in his tomb would actually be buried there, especially in the Roman imperial period when the lists of potential occupants were often extremely long, and sometimes open-ended. Many of those listed in the tomb family probably did not take up their tenancy rights, for one reason or another – for example, if they eventually built tombs of their own. No doubt there was a good deal of status attached to having tenancy rights in a particular tomb; and no doubt the tomb owner himself derived some prestige from putting on display a long list of 'dependants' to whom his *post mortem* hospitality was extended. But most importantly, perhaps, the list of eligible occupants provided a clear delineation of the family structure, a public statement of the owner's immediate circle of relatives, friends, and retainers. And this may have been as important to the tomb owner as providing a reference list of the eligible occupants.

In some instances, the tomb owner left instructions indicating where in his tomb the various occupants were to be placed. We might note, for example, the stipulation which Ida Makhzza made in TL 57, the tomb in this case consisting of upper and lower chambers. After making provision in general terms for the burial of his wife and children, Ida Makhzza states in lines 6–7:

hrzzi prñnawi:mei:ñtepi tãti l[dã:m]akhzzã:se la[dã
d.. s]e [iye] n[e.... tã]ti tike kbi:hrpplie

(and) in the upper building they will place within Ida Makhzza
and...(his) wife, and they will not place anyone else upon them.

This would seem to indicate that the upper chamber was for the exclusive tenancy of Ida Makhzza and his wife. It would follow, then, that the other persons mentioned in the inscription, namely Ida Makhzza's children, were to be confined to the lower chamber, designated as the *hyposorion* in the Greek texts.

The practice of making specific place allocations within the tombs

was one which continued through the Roman period; and the Greek inscriptions, from the 3rd century onwards, are often much more explicit in fact in the allocation of burial space. This is particularly so when the tomb owner made provision for a wide range of family connections, or when a tomb was jointly owned by two or more persons, each of whom wished to make provision for the burial of his own family. In these cases, the inscription often contains quite explicit instructions to indicate precisely where in the tomb each of the eligible occupants was to be placed. And as a rule in cases of joint ownership each of the owners was free to use his allotted space in whatever way he chose, but could not encroach on the space allotted to his co-owner(s) (see Bryce, 1980a, 172–73). The main concern was probably to ensure a systematic arrangement within the tomb, and also to ensure that the homogeneity of each of the family groups was preserved intact.

On some occasions the burial allocations in the Greek inscriptions draw a broad distinction between the various members of extended family units, most notably in cases where *threptoi*,⁶ freedmen, slaves, and more remote family connections were relegated to the *hyposorion* of the tomb, while the more privileged family members were assigned to the upper area or areas.⁷ It may be that such a distinction sometimes applied in the epichoric period as well, but at present we have no clear-cut evidence for this.

Once the tomb owner had decided who had the right to be buried in his tomb, and in some cases where inside the tomb the various occupants were to be placed, his next concern was to try to ensure that his instructions would be carried out. The inscriptions generally contain an explicit statement of what constitutes a violation of these instructions – as a rule, unauthorised interments and/or unauthorised use of reserved

6. On the meaning of θρεπτός, τροφός and other related terms, see Cameron, 1939, 27–62.

7. See, e.g., TAM II 217. 4–5, 218. 5–6, 223. 16–17, 247. 8–9, 322. 6–7, 438. 13–14, 454. 6–9, in which persons of inferior status including slaves, freedmen, and *threptoi* are consigned to the *hyposorion*, and TAM II 208, 212, and 213 in which the upper areas of the tomb are reserved for the more privileged occupants – generally the tomb owner and his immediate family.

burial space within a tomb.

In neither the epichoric nor the Greek inscriptions are there any violation clauses which refer to specifically criminal offences, such as the malicious damage of a tomb or theft of its contents; criminal acts of this nature were no doubt subject to a different type of disciplinary process which fell outside the scope of the sepulchral inscriptions. The tomb owner's main concern was to prevent the use of his tomb by *unauthorised* persons. Admittedly in a number of Greek inscriptions the would-be offender is threatened with the νόμος τυμβωρυχίας which very likely did cover a variety of criminal offences committed against a tomb or its occupants. But within the context of the sepulchral inscriptions this law invariably refers to unauthorised burials, and never to offences of an intrinsically criminal nature.⁸

Provision against unauthorised acts committed upon a tomb could also include the unauthorised carving of a new inscription or the erasure of an old. Again, such an action was not an intrinsically criminal offence since a tomb owner reserved the right to add supplementary clauses to an original inscription. Both the epichoric and the Greek inscriptions provide examples of this.⁹ Similarly, an original inscription could be erased quite legitimately if a tomb passed into the hands of a new owner. There are several examples in the Greek inscriptions where a second inscription was inscribed over an earlier one in order to indicate change of ownership.¹⁰

* * *

8. We know from several inscriptions that a law against τυμβωρυχία was in force at least from the 1st century A.D. onwards, and probably dates back much earlier than this. The distinction in law in Roman times between illegal use of a tomb and criminal acts committed upon it (desecration etc.) was probably somewhat blurred. The tomb owner if he so wished could probably have cases involving illegal use of his tomb dealt with under the same legal procedure which applied to other cases of τυμβωρυχία.

9. See Bryce, 1975, 33-35, particularly in relation to TL 36 and TAM II 1028.

10. In TAM II 70 we are given the information that Panegorus purchased a tomb from Aurelia Zosime. Lines 1-7 were

Who was responsible for ensuring that the tomb owner's instructions were faithfully carried out? From the inscriptions we learn of a community institution or council called the *miñti*, which seems to have been closely connected with the supervision of the tombs.¹¹ The actual composition of the *miñti* is not known, although Thomsen suggested that it was a type of family council made up of representatives from various households (1899, 67) - presumably those with a vested interest in the tombs. At all events its chief function seems to have been to ensure that only authorised persons were buried in the tombs which fell within its jurisdiction, and it probably also exercised some disciplinary powers against persons guilty of violating the tomb owner's instructions.¹²

A number of inscriptions make reference to a payment to be made to the *miñti*, expressed in terms of a certain number of *adas*. In the past this has generally been interpreted as a fine imposed upon the tomb violator, but I believe that it is more likely to have been a fee, albeit a token fee, payable to the *miñti* for some service it was to render on behalf of the tomb owner - perhaps supervision of the actual burial arrangements for the authorised tomb occupants (see Bryce, 1976a). The monetary value of the Lycian *ada* was very small, perhaps no more than 1/12 or 1/15 of a Greek *mina*;¹³ and since the amounts specified are often no more than two or three *adas*, and the largest amount

probably carved by the first owner, and then on purchasing the tomb the new owner instead of erasing the original inscription simply carved his name over the top of it (see the reproduction of TAM II 70 in TAM II/1, p. 26, based on Hula's *ectypus*). We might also note TAM II 318 where on top of the original letters MOY a second inscription was carved, indicating that Aurelius Hermakotas had purchased the tomb for the interment of himself and his family.

11. The *miñti* are referred to in the following epichoric inscriptions: TL 2. 3, 3. 4, 4. 4, 11. 3, 31. 4, 36. 3, 38. 8, 39. 7, 42. 4, 46. 3, 47. 3, 50. 1, 52. 2, 57. 5, 58. 2, 75. 5, 106. 1, 114. 1, 115. 1, 118. 3, 135. 3, 139. 4, 145. 5(?), 149. 14.
12. The *miñti* figure in the penalty clauses in TL 75. 5 and 139. 4 which are concerned with the punishment of persons defying the tomb owner's instructions.
13. Cf. Bryce, 1976a, 177, and Laroche, 1979b, 101. And on the Lycian numeral which determines the relationship between the *ada* and the *mina*, see above, pp. 62-63.

may have been no more than 10 1/2 adas,¹⁴ approximately 2/3 of a mina, it is hardly likely that the *miñti* performed a very laborious service for this amount. One would have to say that the fee, if that is what it was, must have been a very nominal one. Yet if so, what point was there in a tomb owner adding such an apparently trivial detail to his inscription? Perhaps the important point was not so much the size of the fee as the indication that the *miñti* had some authority over the use of the tomb, which quite possibly provided a measure of protection against defiance of the tomb owner's instructions. In one of the early Greek inscriptions from Lycia, there is a stipulation that no interment could take place, even of eligible occupants, without the authorisation or (perhaps) the presence of the *miñti*,¹⁵ and this no doubt acted as a safeguard against unauthorised burials.

At all events the *miñti*'s role was apparently of some importance in ensuring proper use of certain tombs at a time when interment rights were generally limited to a tomb owner's immediate family and rarely extended beyond two generations. But by the end of the epichoric period, the *miñti* seems to have become virtually defunct. It is referred to in only three Greek inscriptions, which are of comparatively early date,¹⁶ and certainly by the Roman imperial period had disappeared altogether.

Yet in the Roman period the enlarged tomb families, and the apparent lack of any institution concerned specifically with the supervision of burial rights must have made it increasingly difficult to ensure that only eligible persons were admitted to the tombs. Moreover, the apparent reluctance of many of the later tomb owners to impose an upper limit on the size of the tomb family resulted in a variety of provisory and supplementary clauses in the Greek inscriptions, which

14. TL 50 concludes with $\alpha\delta\alpha\ \omicron\div$. The numerical quantity has been interpreted both as 10 1/2 and as 15; see above, p. 62.

15. Petersen and von Luschan, 1889, 22, no. 27, line 4: $\mu\eta\ \epsilon\epsilon\epsilon\sigma\tau\omega\ \delta\epsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\omicron\lambda\gamma\epsilon\iota\upsilon\ \mu\eta\theta\epsilon\nu\ \delta\epsilon\nu\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\delta\omicron\varsigma$.

16. Petersen and von Luschan, 1889, 22, no. 27, TAM II 62, and TAM II 40. The last of these refers to the $\mu\epsilon\nu\delta\omicron\tau\alpha\iota$, presumably the individual members of the group.

would appear to have complicated the situation even further. In a number of cases the owner indicates the possibility of his making additions to the burial list, either in a supplement to the original inscription, or by an entry in the public archives, or perhaps even by verbal consent.¹⁷ There are also cases in which the tomb owner delegates the right of authorising additional burials to certain specified persons - for example, his wife, his children, or his heirs,¹⁸ and in one case to all prospective tomb occupants, whether or not they have been named by the owner in the original burial provisions (TAM II 602. 7-10).

The eligible members of the extended tomb families may to some extent have taken over the supervisory role once exercised by the *miñti*. Nevertheless effective supervision of the tombs became a far more complex matter, especially in view of the proliferation of these tombs during the Roman period, and the 'open-ended' formulae in the inscriptions which often made it difficult to determine precisely who had, and who had not, been granted burial rights. Perhaps for this reason incentive was given to informants to bring to light 'violations' which might otherwise go unnoticed.¹⁹ The system of laying information, with the inducement of a substantial monetary reward in the event of a successful prosecution, may have been operating in Lycia long before the Roman imperial period, and was perhaps similar in some respects to the system of $\sigma\upsilon\kappa\omicron\phi\alpha\nu\tau\iota\lambda\alpha$ which became prevalent in Athens during the 5th century B.C.

After stating what constitutes unauthorised use of his tomb, the tomb owner frequently concluded his inscription with a penalty clause which indicates that anyone disregarding his instructions will be liable to punishment by one or more disciplinary authorities. During the epichoric period, tombs were in most cases under the protection of one or more deities, and any violations of the tomb owner's instructions were likely

17. Cf. TAM II 72, 8-9, 78. 1-3, 121. 4-6, 215. 4-5, 326. 6-8, 331. 2-3, 357. 8, 618. 6, 754. 4, 989. 4-7.

18. Cf. TAM II 61. 9-14, 224. 6-12, 321, 323. 5-6, 599. 4-5, 980. 2-3, 1096. 2-3, 1227. 7-10.

19. According to Arkwright, 'experience seems to have shown that they (i.e. the tomb owner's heirs or descendants) were apt through supineness, timidity, or possibly corruption, to neglect their duty' (1911, 270).

to bring divine retribution upon the offender. Some penalty clauses contain no more than a simple threat of punishment by a deity, or a group of deities - e.g. TL 93. 3:

mē ne trqas tubidi se muhāi huwedri

(the god) Trqas and the *huwedri* gods will punish him (i.e. the offender).

But a number of tomb owners combined or replaced the threat of divine retribution with a threat of punitive action by more tangible authorities - e.g. the *itlehi*, possibly an administrative official, or group of officials, whose jurisdiction extended into the religious sphere (see below pp. 135-36). We might also note in this connection TL 56. 3-4 where the offender was to be subject to the judgment both of the local mother goddess and the municipal authorities at Phellos:

*se iye ti edi:tike:mētē:me ne qasttu:ēni:qlahi:ebiyehi:
se wedri:wehñtezi*

And who(ever) commits an offence(?) against them, let the mother of this *sanctuary(?)* and the municipality of Wehñta (= Phellos) pass judgment upon him.

In some cases the offender seems to have been liable to punishment under regulations laid down by the *miñti* for the proper use of the tombs, to judge from TL 118. 3, 135. 3(?), and 139. 4 which refer to the *maraziya miñtaha* ('the tribunal(?) of the *miñti*) within the context of a penalty clause (see above, Chapter 3, n. 101).

No doubt there were established procedures for judging and punishing persons guilty of tomb violations. These perhaps included some direction on the nature and size of the penalty to be imposed, which is generally not indicated in the inscriptions (unless the inscriptions containing the *ada* formula fall into this category). However, a small number of inscriptions from Limyra in which the penalty is clearly specified suggests that payment in kind may have been the usual form the penalty took. Note TL 131. 2-4:

*se iye ti:eseri tadi tike khupa:ebehi ... me ttliidi
ēni qlahi:ebiyehi nuñtāta am[m]ājma:uwa*

and who(ever) places anyone (else) with them in the chamber of this (tomb)will pay *nuñtāta*²⁰ cattle as a penalty(?) to the mother of this *sanctuary(?)*²¹

It may well be that the penalty was always determined in kind - a certain number of livestock, and/or a certain quantity of grain²² - and was probably regarded as a form of expiatory offering rather than simply as a form of punishment. Moreover in some cases the penalty may have involved not only an initial payment, but also a series of subsequent payments to be made on a regular basis.²³

By the Roman period, the rapidly increasing number of tombs, the wide range of tomb owners, and in many cases the indefinitely large number of potential tomb occupants seem to have led to a streamlining of the disciplinary procedures, which no doubt greatly reduced the deliberative functions of the disciplinary bodies concerned. The inscription itself specified not only the nature of the violation and the identity of the disciplinary bodies, but also the size of the penalty, the proportion to be paid to the informant, and the proportion to be paid to any other parties involved in the action. For example in TAM II 325 the offence is specified as unauthorised burial, the penalty 4000 denarii, of which 1500 den. are to be allocated to the *ταφίας* and 2500 to the *γερονσία* of the city of Xanthos; in TAM II 626, 1/3 of the penalty is to be paid to the informant.²⁴

* * *

20. On *nuñtāta*, see above, Chapter 3, n. 87.

21. The other inscriptions which indicate payment in kind by way of penalty are TL 102 (2-3), 111 (2-3), and 131 (3-4).

22. Note that in TL 131 the tomb violator will be liable to a penalty of *nuñtāta* head of cattle, and possibly also to a monthly (*rīmazata*) payment of grain(?) (*khḡa-*). For the interpretation of *khḡa-* as 'grain', as suggested by Neumann, see above, Chapter 3, n. 98.

23. As suggested by the penalty clause in TL 131, referred to in n. 21.

24. Cf. TAM II 73. 4-5: penalty - 3500 den., 500 den. of which

I have suggested above that while the majority of tomb occupants could look forward to no more than temporary occupancy of a tomb before having to make way for new arrivals, in some cases the tomb owner and other privileged occupants enjoyed the prospect of permanent undisturbed residence. In a few of these cases there may also have been a type of funerary cult established, involving periodic sacrifices in honour of the dead. Several of the Greek inscriptions from the Roman imperial period provide for sacrificial offerings (e.g. a cock and a fowl) to be made to the tomb occupants at certain times of the year by the descendants or heirs of the tomb owner (e.g. *TAM II* 245, 636, 637, 715), and it may well be that the performance of sacrificial rites in such a context dates back to a much earlier period. Tritsch suggested that the relief on the east side of the so-called Harpy tomb at Xanthos can be so interpreted (1942, 47-50).²⁵ In this relief a small figure is depicted making an offering of a cock in the presence of a seated, bearded figure - perhaps the tomb owner who was evidently a man of considerable importance and may in fact have been an early Lycian dynast.²⁶

One of the epichoric inscriptions, *TL 84*, may also refer to sacrificial rites performed in honour of the tomb owner - in this case Mizretiye, an official in the town of Sura. The relevant section of the inscription reads as follows:

mede tew[ē] kumezeitī uhazata tuweri se mizratiyehe;
kumehi adaiye: ||-:uraziye [..] adi:ē seyepi hadi ti:
[s]e mei ne:kumazati me ne:pddē:qla:sūmatī:ebi:surezi
(lines 5-7)

the *tuweri* will make sacrifice yearly, and will provide a victim (in honour?) of Mizretiye (to the value of?) 2 1/2 *uraziye* adas. And whom(ever) one appoints (?), if he does not become sacrificer, the local sanctuary(?) here at Sura will hold him responsible(?).

are to be paid to the demos of Telmessos, and 3000 to the fiscus(?); *TAM II* 526. 41-42: penalty - 6000 dr., 3000 dr. of which are to be paid to the owner's grandson, and 3000 to the demos.

25. Cf. Bryce, 198b, 41-42.

26. The precise interpretation of the Harpy tomb reliefs is, however, very much open to question. The reliefs will be discussed in some detail in vol. II.

We may have another example of a sacrificial rite which is to be performed in honour of the deceased in the final words of *TL 150*: *khssēñziyaye:hberuse zasāni:khadrīna;uhazata:kumezeine*. Only three of these words can be translated - *khssēñziyaye* = 'for Khssēñziya' (the tomb owner), *uhazata kumezeine* = 'to sacrifice yearly' - but these are sufficient to suggest a reference to a yearly sacrifice to be carried out in honour of the tomb owner.^{26a}

One of the more recently discovered epichoric inscriptions, *N 304*, also contains instructions for a sacrificial rite. The inscription is very fragmentary, but it seems to provide for the monthly sacrificial offering of an ox or a sheep.²⁷ It is not, however, a sepulchral inscription, and may be connected with the cult of a particular deity (or deities) rather than with a funerary cult.

In general, the inscriptions of Asia Minor provide relatively few examples of funerary cults established in honour of the tomb owner or the tomb family as a whole. However we might compare our Lycian examples with a late 1st century Greek inscription from Apateira in the valley of the Caystros river (in the territory of Ephesos). In this case Peplos, the owner of the heroon, has founded an association of ἡρωῖσταί, the members of which are responsible for the care of the heroon and the funerary cult of the persons who are buried there.²⁸

* * *

We know little of the rituals and procedures which accompanied Lycian burials, although an interesting, and as far as I know unique, funerary custom is alleged in two of our literary sources of the Roman

26a. *TL 74b* may provide a further example of a sacrificial rite in honour of the deceased. See Borchhardt et al., 1985, 91, and 121-26.

27. Indications of this are given by *k]umezetī* [1 or *k]umezein[e*, referring to the act of sacrifice (line 1), and *u]wa* or *wa]wa* ('ox') or *ka]wa* ('sheep') (line 2). In line 5 the word *armma* ('monthly') may indicate that the sacrifice is to be performed at monthly intervals.

28. For the inscription, see Keil and Premierstein, 1914, 88-90; see also Kubinska, 1968, 125.

imperial period. The Roman historian Valerius Maximus (2. 16. 3) in a survey of rites of passage practised by different peoples refers to a Lycian custom whereby males wear female garments as a sign of mourning for the departed. The same custom is also referred to by Plutarch (*consol. ad Apoll. 112F-113A*) who offers an explanation for it. In his letter to Apollonius, Plutarch urges Apollonius to sustain his personal grief with fortitude, maintaining that excess of grief is unmanly, as the Lycians show by wearing female garments when in mourning.

Whether or not the Lycians ever did practise such a custom is a matter of some doubt; and even if they did, Plutarch's explanation of it must be regarded as highly suspect. Conceivably such a practice could have been a fossilised relic of the past whose origins the Lycians of the Roman period had forgotten, and to which a quite spurious explanation came to be attached. But if it was a genuine relic of an earlier period in the civilisation, it is surprising that Herodotos makes no mention of it. This is precisely the sort of detail one would expect him to comment on. Perhaps the Lycians had a tradition of wearing certain types of garments at funerals which were later misinterpreted as female garments.

But if we suppose for a moment that the Lycians did wear female garments on such occasions, is it possible that the practice was intended to have an apotropaic function? Transvestitism seems on some occasions to have served this purpose on Greek and Roman wedding days - a means of confusing or duping malevolent spirits likely to be lurking around. And a similar explanation might be offered for the alleged Lycian funerary practice. Sir James Frazer suggested that the Lycian practice 'might be intended to conceal them (Lycian men) from the ghost, just as perhaps for a similar reason some peoples of antiquity used to descend into pits and remain there for several days, shunning the light of the sun, whenever a death had taken place in the family' (1927, 264). Delcourt suggests that the men may have worn female garments in the belief that malevolent spirits were less likely to harm females than they were males (1958, 6).²⁹ But all such proposals must be regarded as highly

29. Delcourt's explanation for this is that 'les femmes ayant moins de valeur, les démons laisseront indemnes ceux qui se dissimulent sous leurs habits'.

speculative, since as far as I know there are no parallels to the alleged Lycian practice, and we must have serious reservations about its genuineness.

Ranks, titles, and professions in Lycian society

In the introductory statements in the inscriptions, the tomb owner as a rule provides some form of identification of himself. This identification is expressed most commonly by reference to an important family connection, usually the owner's parent.³⁰ But it can also be expressed by reference to a particular office which the owner had held, or by reference to the town or towns of which he was a citizen. Occasionally we find a combination of all three.

If the comparatively small number of inscribed tombs of the 5th and 4th centuries indicates that the owners of these tombs belonged to the upper strata of Lycian society, then we can assume that the titles which the owners bore or the professions in which they were occupied were high-ranking ones.³¹ Unfortunately we do not have enough information to be able to determine the precise nature of these titles and professions. Some of them, however, can be broadly categorised as religious in function, and some as secular, on the basis of the contexts in which they occur. Several others, while clearly indicating ranks or titles, cannot be more precisely defined as either religious or secular, and may in fact have combined both functions.

We note that many of the terms in question incorporate the suffix -aza.³² But not all the -aza words in Lycian can be classified as

30. We cannot assume that the parent in question was always the father since in most cases it is impossible to tell whether a Lycian proper name is masculine or feminine.

31. In the case of priestly offices in particular we note that it was common practice in many Near Eastern societies for these offices to be held by members of the aristocracy. See Sullivan, 1978. Sullivan comments: 'The high position of priests...reflects a unanimity throughout Anatolia on the fundamental place of religion in society.' (p. 938).

32. See Meriggi, 1928, 443-45, and the list in Houwink ten Cate, 1965, 63, sec. 10. Note also the discussion by Laroche, 1979b, 98-100.

official titles or ranks since some are quite clearly personal names - e.g. Sbakaza (TL 106. 1) and Izraza (TL 24) - and others may be terms of family relationship.³³ Consequently we must relegate to the 'Doubtful' category any of these terms which we are unable to classify on the basis of contextual or other considerations.

These considerations provide the basis for the following list, obviously a tentative and incomplete one, of Lycian titles, ranks, and professions.

RELIGIOUS

akhātaza (TL 149.3)
 kumaza (TL 26.20, 49, 65.22, 111. 1, N 320.9 and 36, 322.2).
 mahinaza (TL 133. 1)
 uwehi (TL 22. 2, 29. 3 and 4, 92. 2)

SECULAR

asakhlaza (N 320. 5)
 khñtawati (TL 35. 1, 44 b 58, 62, and 63, N 320. 7-8, 8-9, 17, 23-24, and 28)
 khñtawaza (TL 44 d 67)
 pddēnehñmi (TL 106. 1, N 320. 3-4)
 sttrat (TL 44 b 18)

RELIGIOUS/SECULAR?

itlehi (TL 57.9, 83.16, 88.5, 89.3, 90.5, 94.2, 95.3, 118.3, 134.4, 150.7)
 maraza (TL 44 c 4)
 mluhidaza (TL 84.1)
 tewinaza (N 306. 1)

DOUBTFUL

hakhlaza (TL 44 a 51)
 khddaza (N 320. 20)
 mlatraza (TL 44 b 40)

tabahaza (TL 44 b 53)
 wasaza (TL 38.4)
 zkhkhaza (TL 44 b 57, c 6)
 zzimaza (TL 54.2)
 mlāñnaza (TL 143.4)

DISCUSSION

(a) Religious offices

(i) The titles or ranks designated as religious in function are generally found in association with a particular deity. For example *kumaza*, the term used in the tomb owner's identification formula in TL 49, TL 111, and N 322, is associated with the god Trzzubi in TL 111 (*erzesinube kumaza* [tr]zzuba[h] and the god Qeli in N 322 (*qelehi kumaza*).

More precise information about the office of *kumaza* is provided by the trilingual, where it is equated with the Greek ἱερεὺς. Simias has been appointed as the priest of the two deities in whose honour the cult has been established, with the task of supervising their cult and making annual sacrifice to them on behalf of the townspeople and *perioikoi* of Xanthos. Several other cognate forms of *kumaza* appear in the trilingual; namely *kumezi* = θύειν, *kumaha* = κατερώθη, *kumeziye* = βωμός, and *kumehi* = ἱερεῖον. The comparisons with the Greek suggest that these terms refer specifically to the act of sacrifice; e.g. *kumezi* = 'make sacrifice', *kumeziye* = 'altar', i.e. the place where sacrifice is made, *kumehi* = 'victim', i.e. the object sacrificed.³⁴ It may be then that *kumaza* basically means 'one who makes sacrifice', and this may in fact indicate the principal function of the *kumaza* - an official appointed to make sacrifice in honour of a particular cult or deity. Presumably this was the most important function exercised by Simias in his role as *kumaza* in the newly established cult at the Letoon (see below, Chapter 6, pp. 192-94).

33. *zzimaza* (TL 54. 2) and *wasaza* (TL 38.4) may fall into this category. On *zzimaza*, see Meriggi, 1928, 444, and Laroche, 1979b, 99, and on *wasaza* see Laroche, 1979b, 99.

34. See Eichner's discussion of the possible etymology of these cognate words, 1983, 59-62.

(ii) The terms *akhātaza* and *uwehi* are also used in contexts which indicate that they are primarily religious in function. For example, in TL 149 the tomb owner Iyamara is identified as *maliyahi wedrēñnehi akhātaza* - 'akhātaza of the regional'³⁵ (goddess) Maliya', and in TL 22 the tomb owner Hrikhtbili is identified as *mahanahi uwehi* - 'uwehi of the gods'.

The fact that all these terms - *kumaza*, *akhātaza*, *uwehi* - refer apparently to religious offices might indicate a relatively high degree of specialisation in the religious roles undertaken by leading members of Lycian society. And it is clear that in some cases certain persons were appointed as priests or attendants attached to the worship of a particular deity as distinct from the Lycian gods in general.

iii) We might also include in the religious category the term *mahinaza*. In TL 133 the tomb owner Khñtlapa identifies himself as the *mahinaza* of the Lycian Perikle. Laroche, taking up a suggestion originally made by Meriggi, connects the term with *mahana*- 'god', and suggests that it means 'prophet' or 'seer'.³⁶ The suggestion is a plausible one, and might tie in with the information provided by our Greek literary sources that Lycia and Caria were notable centres for the practice of divination (see below, Chapter 6).

The likely importance of Khñtlapa's office may be indicated by the fact that, contrary to usual practice, the official title *precedes* the parental identification: *khñtlapāne:prñnawate:perikleh:mahinaza:epñtibazah tideimi* - Khñtlapa, *mahinaza* of Perikle, son of Epñtibaza, built it'.

(b) Secular offices

(i) *asakhlaza* is one of the very few -*aza* terms indicating a title or profession which is clearly secular in function. The term occurs only once, in the trilingual, where we are informed that Erttimeli has been

35. 'regional' is the suggested translation of the epithet *wedrēñni* which is cognate with *wedri*; *wedri* means something like 'region, district, municipality'. Quite clearly *wedrēñni* indicates the geographical sphere in which the goddess Maliya operated. See also Bryce, 1981a, 83.

36. Laroche, 1979b, 99 (cf. Meriggi, 1928, 445). Thomsen had earlier proposed the meaning 'conseiller' (1899, 45).

appointed *asakhlaza* of Xanthos by the Carian satrap Pixodaros (line 5). *asakhlaza* which corresponds to ἐπιμελητής in the Greek version of the trilingual,³⁷ seems to designate here the administrative representative of the local satrap in Lycia's chief city.

(ii) The most prestigious title in the inscriptions is *khñtawati*,³⁸ a term which is equated with βασιλεύς in the trilingual where it is used in reference to a god. Its corresponding abstract *khñtawata* appears in a number of inscriptions in the quasi-dating formula *ēñē...khñtawata* - 'under the command/authority (of)...'.³⁹ On the basis of this formula, we can make a list of those persons who apparently held, or were accorded the title *khñtawati*:

- (1) Alexander the Great, if he is identifiable with the Alakhssañtra who appears in TL 29. 9.⁴⁰ *khñtawata* appears in the same context as Alakhssañtra, although not in the standard *ēñē...khñtawata* formula.
- (2) the Lydian satrap Autophradates (Lycian Wataprrdate) (TL 61. 2).
- (3) members of the ruling dynasty at Xanthos - Kheriga (TL 43. 2), Arppakhu (Harpagos) (TL 77 2b-3b, N 310.4).
- (4) the Lycian Perikle (TL 67.2, 83. 5-6, 103.3, 132. 1-2, N 314. 7-8)⁴¹
- (5) other Lycian coin issuers - Mithrapata (TL 64. 2) and Arttuñpara (TL 11. 2-3). In this latter case Arttuñpara appears not in the *ēñē...khñtawata* formula but as the subject of the verb

37. On the range of officials which could be covered by the term *epimeletes* in Greek, see Wörle, 1975, 72-73, n. 6.

38. For a recent, comprehensive discussion of this term and its corresponding abstract *khñtawata*, see Heubeck, 1979. Earlier discussions of the term are cited by Heubeck, 1979, 247-48, n. 1.

39. On the interpretation of this formula, see Gusmani, 1963, 284 ff., and Heubeck, 1979, 249-50. Laroche originally suggested that *ēñē...khñtawata* was a title - 'sous-officer' (1957/58, 182, followed by Houwink ten Cate, 1965, 9, 92 - 'under-strategus'); but see more recently his translation of TL 43. 2 (1974b, 134).

40. See above, Chapter 3, p. 49 and cf. Heubeck, 1979, 256.

41. In N 314a. 7-8 we read *ē]ti khñtawata p]eriklehe* (*ē]ti* as restored by Carruba). On this variation on the standard formula, see Carruba, 1979, 82.

khñtewete:⁴² trñmĩsñ:khñtewete ter[.] arttuñpara -
'Arttuñpara ruled/governed - as - khñtawata ter. (?) Lycia'.

In addition to these references, we might also note TL 35. 1 where the term *khñtawati* occurs, perhaps in reference to *pttule*, which Laroche identifies as the Lycian name of one of the early Ptolemies. I have already expressed my reservations about this identification (see above, Chapter 3, p. 49-50).

It seems clear from the examples listed above that the term *khñtawati*/*khñtawata* did not indicate a precise station or rank, since it could be used of a god, satrap, members of the ruling Xanthian dynasty, the Lycian Perikle,⁴³ and other prominent Lycians known also from their coin issues. It may also have been a title bestowed on Alexander the Great after his conquest of Lycia, and perhaps on one of the early Ptolemies who exercised authority in Asia Minor. It was a general term - though undoubtedly a very prestigious one - which was used in reference to high-ranking administrators within Lycia as well as to outsiders who came to exercise authority over the country.⁴⁴

We might also note here the term *khñtawaza* which occurs in the Lycian B or Milyan text on side d of the Xanthos stele inscription (TL 44 d 67). Conceivably *khñtawaza* belongs to the category of -aza terms which denote ranks, titles, professions (cf. Houwink ten Cate, 1965, 63, Korol'ov and Ševoroškin, 1969, 528). But it may on the other hand be the Lycian B equivalent of the abstract *khñtawata* (translated by Gusmani as 'Herrschaft' - 1963, 288).

42. On this form see Pedersen, 1945, 17, sec. 25, Gusmani, 1960, 502, n. 15, 1963, 288, n. 25, 1968, 9, Neumann, 1969, 389, 1976, 84, Heubeck, 1979, 250-51, Laroche, 1979b, 105.

43. We might also note that in one of the two literary sources which refer to him the Lycian Perikle is designated as βασιλεὺς (*Theopompus*, Jac. 115 F 103), which indirectly provides a further example of the equation between the Lycian term *khñtawati* and the Greek βασιλεὺς. Cf. Heubeck, 1979, 255.

44. Cf. Heubeck, 1979, 257, Laroche, 1979b, 104-06. The term occurs also in a number of passages in the Xanthos stele inscription: TL 44 a 51, b 37, 58, 62, 63, 64, c 8-9, 10-11. With the partial exception of c 8-9, the passages in question are obscure and are thus of little value to the present discussion.

(iii) *pddēnehñmi*. In TL 106 the tomb owner Sbukaza identifies himself as *şurtta miñtehi pddēnehñmi*. While it is not altogether clear how this phrase should be construed, I suggest that the genitive *miñtehi* is dependent on *pddēnehñmi*, and that *miñtehi pddēnehñmi* is appositional to *şurtta* - 'Sbukaza, *şurtta*, *pddēnehñmi* of the *miñti*'. The general meaning of *pddēnehñmi* is now made clear by the trilingual where it appears in the accus. plur. form *pddēnehñmis* (lines 3-4) and is equated with ἀρχοντας in the Greek version (line 3). Laroche suggests for it the meaning 'commissaires' ('commissioners') (1979b, 60-61). The context in which it occurs in the trilingual clearly indicates that it can be used in reference to high-ranking administrative positions, in this case perhaps the most important administrative positions in Lycia under the Hekatomnid regime. But it probably has a relative rather than an absolute meaning - i.e. its precise sense depends on the context in which it is used and the terms with which it is associated. Thus we have *pddēnehñmis* for the whole of Lycia and a *pddēnehñmi* of a local *miñti*. In the latter case I suggest that the person with this title had perhaps been appointed as the chief official of the organisation, a position which may have been sufficiently prestigious to justify its inclusion in the identification formula of a sepulchral inscription.

The meaning of *şurtta* is quite obscure.

(iv) *sttrat* occurs in a fragmentary context after the name Aruwātiyesi in TL 44 b 18, a name which belongs to a 4th century coin-issuer in Lycia (to be discussed in vol. II). It is possible, though far from certain, that *sttrat* is the first part of a Lycianised form of the Greek στρατηγός, and if so it may have been the Lycian term for a military commander, representing a direct borrowing from Greek.

(c) Religious or Secular Office (or both)

(i) *itlehi* appears frequently as a disciplinary authority in the penalty clauses of the sepulchral inscriptions, where it is regularly qualified by *trñmili* ('Lycian'), and sometime also by *huwedri*.⁴⁵ It has been variously interpreted as a term designating an office holder, the office

45. E.g. TL 83. 16, 88. 5, 95. 3, 118. 3, 150. 7.

itself, or a corporation, federation, or the like (see Bryce, 1981a, 87). A number of scholars have equated it with the Greek terms ταμίας, ταμείον, or φύλακος in view of the frequency with which these terms appear in similar contexts in the Greek inscriptions, referring to disciplinary authorities involved in punitive action against tomb violators.⁴⁶

Heubeck, however, has recently argued against these equations. He construes *huwedri* as a plural adjective used to qualify *itlehi*, (which must therefore be plural), and suggests that the *itlehi* are a group of divine beings like the Lycian *tesēti* – the oath gods – who are also invoked in the penalty clauses (1982, 109–10). Heubeck's proposal is quite plausible, and if he is right, we should transfer the *itlehi* to our discussion of the Lycian deities in Chapter 6.

On the other hand, we cannot rule out the possibility that *itlehi* refers to officials in Lycia, either individually or in a group, whose functions and responsibilities may have been religious as well as secular in nature. We might compare the functions of the ταμίας, whose office had distinct religious overtones, as indicated by the epithet ἱερῶτατος which appears regularly in association with ταμίας in the Greek inscriptions.⁴⁷

(ii) *maraza*. As Laroche points out, *maraza* almost certainly derives from *mara/mere* ('law') and is probably the Lycian word for judge (1979b, 98, cf. Heubeck, 1982, 110). The term occurs only once, in the Xanthos stele inscription (TL 44 c 4), in a passage which begins with references to Tissaphernes, Kaunos, Athens, and continues with a reference to the erection of a stele (by Otares) in the temenos of Maliya at Athens. We cannot determine what the *maraza's* role was in this context, but his office may well have combined both religious and secular functions.

(iii) *mluhidaza* appears in TL 84 as the office held by the tomb owner Mizretiye in the town of Sura. Our Greek literary sources indicate that Sura was a well known oracular centre in Lycia (see below, Chapter 6), and it is just possible that Mizretiye's office was connected with oracular practices in the area. We cannot, however, be certain that

46. Cf. Imbert, 1896, 230–31, Torp, 1898, 17–18, Pedersen, 1945, 39, sec. 65, Houwink ten Cate, 1965, 94, n.g. on TL 57, Laroche, 1967, 56.

47. E.g. TAM II 59, 63, 77, 83, 89, 221, 222, 228 etc.

the oracular seat attested in Greek literature was already established in Sura during the epichoric period.

(iv) *tewinaza* appears in N 306.1 as the title or office held by the tomb owner Piñteusi. But the context in which it occurs gives us no indication of what the nature of Piñteusi's office was.⁴⁸

(d) *The Doubtful category*

Although all the words listed in this category terminate in *-aza* we have insufficient evidence to indicate whether they do in fact refer to titles or professions. The words occurring in the Xanthos stele inscription (*hakhlaza*, *mlatraza*, *tabahaza*, *zkhkhaza*) belong to passages which are quite obscure, (cf. Laroche, 1979b, 99), *wasaza* and *zzimaza* may be terms of family relationship,⁴⁹ *khddaza* is probably the Lycian word for 'slave',⁵⁰ and *mlāñnaza* may simply be a personal name. In general there is too much uncertainty surrounding these words to make any detailed statements or assumptions about them.

In the Roman imperial period, as in the epichoric period, a number of tomb owners identified themselves as the holders of religious or secular offices, although clearly by this time a much wider range of social classes were represented. Tomb owners of priestly rank, generally associated with particular deities,⁵¹ are fairly common, and include both women and slaves. On the other hand, a wide range of secular offices are represented. Tomb owners are sometimes identified as teachers,

48. See further on *tewinaza* Neumann, 1969, 380. On the likely relationship between *tewinaza* and the personal name *Tewinezēi*, see Laroche, 1979b, 99, and Neumann, 1983, 146.

49. See the references cited in n. 33 above.

50. See most recently Eichner, 1983, 54–59. Other references to Lycian slaves occur in Herodotos 1. 176 (slaves at Xanthos at the time of the Persian conquest) and IG II², 1951, lines 73, 143, 165, 361, 371, 401 (referring to Lycian slaves in the Athenian navy; for a recent discussion of the inscription, see Jordan, 1975, 265).

51. E.g. SEG II 672 which refers to the tomb owner as priestess for life of Artemis. Cf. TAM II 434 where the tomb occupant is referred to as priestess of Demeter. Sometimes the priest(ess) is designated as being in the service of deified members of the imperial household – e.g. TAM II 206. 4–5, 328a. 7–9.

doctors, or soldiers,⁵² but much more commonly as the holders of political or administrative posts.⁵³

Identification by citizenship is very rare in the epichoric inscriptions but quite common in the Greek, an understandable situation in view of the apparently much greater fluidity of the Lycian population in the Roman period, and the fact that individual Lycians in this period often held citizenship rights in two or more towns⁵⁴ - rights which may well have had important practical implications, especially as far as legal and political privileges were concerned. But such matters fall outside the scope of our present investigation.

Lycian family relationships

Indirectly, the inscriptions provide a wide range of information on Lycian family structures and family ties. In contrast to the large amorphous tomb families of the Roman period, the tomb families of the epichoric period were generally much smaller, more coherent, more definable units. In most instances the tomb owner provided for the burial of himself, his wife, and his children in his tomb. But there are also a significant number of cases where other family connections were provided for. In the main these were restricted to a small group of lineal and collateral family connections, including the owner's mother (TL 86, 95, 127) and grandchildren (TL 127, 146) in the former category, and his brothers (TL 8, 37, 48a, 89) and nephews/nieces (TL 8, 48a, 95, 127) in the latter.

52. E.g. TAM II 224. 3, 339. 1-2, 485.

53. E.g. TAM II 366. 2-3, 382.4-6, 437.5-6, 949.2, 1151.1-2.

54. Some examples of joint citizenship bring together the names Xanthos and Telmessos (TAM II 156), Xanthos and Pinara (TAM II 194, 308), Xanthos and Patara (TAM II 304, 432, 487), Xanthos and Sidyma (TAM II 236, 306, 347), Kadyanda and Xanthos (TAM II 335), Tlos and Xanthos (TAM II 285), Pinara and Sidyma (TAM II 223, 224), Pinara and Kadyanda (TAM II 681), Patara and Sidyma (TAM II 188, 189), Myra and Patara (TAM II 422a), Tlos and Rhodiapolis (TAM II 586), Neisa and Tlos (TAM II 585), Myra, Tlos, Kyaneae (TAM II 586), Akalissos and Rhodiapolis (TAM II 859), Myra and Olympos (TAM II 977).

While we must be careful not to infer too much from what is admittedly a very small group of inscriptions, the provision for the burial of brothers and nephews/nieces perhaps indicates that in some instances collateral ties involved certain obligations and responsibilities including, if the need arose and circumstances permitted, the provision of burial accommodation. We note, for example, from TL 7 and 8 that the tomb owner, Triyētezi, actually built two tombs, one for his wife and children, the other for his brothers and their children.

(a) Avuncular identification

The possibility that in some cases at least particular significance was attached to collateral ties may be supported by the fact that in a number of inscriptions the tomb owner identifies himself by reference to an uncle (or aunt?) as well as to his father (TL 25, 29, 36, 59, 70, 82, 95, 136), and occasionally by reference to an uncle/aunt? alone (TL 84). The Lycian term indicating this relationship is *tuhes*, which we learn from the bilingual TL 25 can mean either nephew or niece.⁵⁵ Thus in TL 36, for example, we can translate the introductory statement (lines 1-3) as follows: 'This building Ahqqadi son of Pizibida/i and nephew (*tuhes*) of Hm̄prāma, has built it.'⁵⁶ Perhaps in some cases, this form of identification was little more than a formality. But even if this is so, it still seems to indicate that a special significance could attach to the relationship between a person and his (or her) brother's or sister's offspring. Some of the possible implications of this have been discussed by Pembroke, (1965, 228-47),⁵⁷ who suggests that two of the inscriptions (TL 29 and 113) may be interpreted to mean that the tomb owner's wife was also his niece; Pembroke draws a parallel with the Greek practice whereby marriage with a brother's daughter was in some instances actually prescribed (1965, 240-41).

55. *tuhes* in line 4 is equated with ἀδελφεοῦς in line 9, and *tuhesñ* (accus. form) in line 7 is equated with ἀδελφεὸν in line 14.

56. There is no immediately recognisable parallel to this form of identification in the Greek inscriptions (but see Pembroke, 1965, 241, n. 3). In not one instance does the tomb owner identify himself initially through an uncle or aunt.

57. Cf. Shafer, 1959, 487 and 501, and Beneviste, 1969, 207.

But in general, the *tuhes* identification raises a number of questions. For instance, is the *tuhes* identifying himself or herself through an uncle or an aunt? Is the relationship thus designated maternal or paternal? Why is this form of identification used next to that of a parent?

Of the various explanations that have been offered, we might note the following:

- (1) the suggestion originally made by Thomsen (1899, 18), that *tuhes* most likely indicates a relationship with a maternal uncle - brother of the tomb owner's mother - so as to indicate the maternal as well as the paternal side of the family by designating the mother's closest male relative.
- (2) the suggestion originally proposed by Shafer (1959, 487 and 501) and taken up by Beneviste (1969, 207) that the *tuhes* nomenclature indicates a system of cross-cousin marriage. According to this system, a man can marry the daughter of his father's sister or his mother's brother, but not the daughter of his father's brother or mother's sister. As Beneviste explains it, the reason for this restriction is that the brother of the father is designated as 'father', and the sister of the mother as 'mother'; hence a person is excluded from marrying the offspring of his 'father' or 'mother' since marriage between brothers and sisters is prohibited. From this Beneviste concludes that for the nephew the 'uncle' is the brother of his mother, and for the uncle the 'nephew' is the son of his sister. It would then follow that in TL 36 Hm̄prāma is the maternal uncle of Ahqqadi.
- (3) The suggestion by Hestermann that *tideimi* and *tuhes* marked a distinction between the tomb owner's 'natural' and 'legal' fathers - the 'legal' father being the eldest brother of the tomb owner's mother (1929, 262-63).

We are unable to substantiate any of these theories, and we must of course bear in mind that the number of instances of avuncular identification in the inscriptions is relatively small. Nevertheless it is quite possible that the *tuhes* form of identification does indicate a special relationship, which existed only in comparatively rare situations - situations in which an uncle did exercise some authority over or have

some legal responsibility for, a nephew or a niece. Such a situation could have occurred if a tomb owner's father had gone to live with his wife's family, who would then in all probability have exercised some authority over the children of the marriage - authority which was perhaps legally vested in a maternal grandfather or uncle. It is not in fact unlikely that a matrilocal system operated to a limited extent in Lycia, both in the epichoric period and in later times. We shall be discussing this possibility below.

The explanations so far outlined place the *tuhes* form of identification essentially in a general family context - i.e. it may have been a means of identifying the mother's side of a tomb family, or it may indicate a matrilocal marriage on the part of the tomb owner's father. In each case the formula is regarded as referring to a *maternal* relationship, a view which is no doubt prompted in the minds of some by Herodotos' statement on Lycian matronymics (l. 173; discussed below).⁵⁸ But it may be that *tuhes* as a form of identification stresses a close personal relationship between two people quite apart from a general family context. And it is also possible that the term was not confined exclusively to a nephew/niece - uncle relationship. Pembroke offers a number of parallels to suggest that *tuhes* may have had a much wider range of meanings. For instance, he compares with *tuhes* the Latin *nepos* which in different contexts can mean 'grandson', 'nephew', or, merely 'descendant' (1965, 240).

It is reasonable to assume, however, that after the natural father an uncle is the most likely relative to establish some form of protective or supervisory relationship with his brother's or sister's offspring.⁵⁹ Indeed, when a tomb owner provides for the burial of his nephews/nieces, he is in effect assuming a responsibility normally exercised by a father. This is a particular instance in which an uncle acts *in loco parentis*, and there may well have been other situations in which an uncle assumed, for one reason or another, a parental role. Perhaps then when

58. E.g. Imbert, 1893, 236-37 and Thomsen, 1899, 18.

59. A number of examples of such a relationship can be cited from Roman society; see, e.g., Pliny, Ep. l. 14, where Junius Mauricus assumes the responsibility of finding a suitable husband for his brother's daughter.

a tomb owner refers to a particular uncle in the initial identification formula, he is acknowledging the existence of a special personal relationship with this person, which warrants mentioning him alongside his natural father.

Generally speaking the relationship with the father was the more important one, both because of the greater frequency with which the paternal identification occurs, and because it invariably precedes the avuncular identification when both forms of identification appear together. In at least one instance, however, *tuhes* appears in the initial identification without *tideimi* ('son') - i.e. a tomb owner identifies himself through his uncle without making any reference to his father:

*ebēññē prñnawā me ti prñnawatē mizretiye murazah tuhes
mluhidaza surezi (TL 84)*

This building Mizretiye has built (it), nephew of Muraza,
mluhidaza at Sura.

Now when a tomb owner names his uncle not in addition to his father but actually in place of him, this may indicate that for one reason or another his natural father has not figured in the normal parental role.⁶⁰ If so, perhaps the uncle named in the inscription has taken a more direct part than usual in his nephew's upbringing. And in such a case it is not inconceivable that some form of adoption or fosterage was involved (cf. Pembroke, 1965, 245-46). The practice of rearing someone else's child is much in evidence in the Greek inscriptions of Lycia, as indicated by the numerous occurrences of *threptos* and related terms in the sepulchral formulae. There were of course major differences between the uncle-nephew relationship and the *tropheus-threptos* relationship. The *threptos* was generally regarded as an inferior member of the household, illustrated by the fact that he was usually buried in the *hyposorion*

60. Note that in TL 95. 2 the tomb owner makes provision for the burial of his mother, which is perhaps a further indication of the absence of the father from the family scene.

or lower chamber of the tomb along with slaves, freedmen, and more distant family connections of the tomb owner; and in some cases he was the owner's offspring by concubinage, and clearly distinguished from the owner's legitimate children (see Bryce, 1979a, 310-12). But it is quite possible that the principle of dependence inherent in the *threptos* institution was to some extent implicit in the nephew/niece identification formula, even if it operated in a rather different way.

(b) Was Lycian society matrilineal?

As far as the overall Lycian family structure was concerned, we have an interesting claim made first by Herodotos, whose comments on the Lycians have the rare distinction of having been made at a time when the Lycian civilisation was still relatively uncontaminated by Greek influence. Herodotos observes that the customs of the Lycians are in some respect similar to those of the Cretans (with whom they allegedly had ethnic ties), and in some respects to those of their neighbours the Carians. Yet, he claims, there is one custom which sets the Lycians apart from all other people - their practice of taking their names not from their fathers but from their mothers:

εἰρομένου δὲ ἑτέρου τὸν πλησίον τίς εἴη, καταλέξει
ἑωυτὸν μητρόθεν καὶ τῆς μητρὸς ἀνανεμέεται τὰς μητέρας.
(1.173)

When a Lycian is asked who he is he will give his own and his mother's name, and then list the mothers of his mother.

A similar claim is made by the 1st century (B.C) writer Nikolaos Damaskenos:

Λύκιοι τὰς γυναῖκας μᾶλλον ἢ τοὺς ἄνδρας τιμῶσι καὶ
καλοῦνται μητρόθεν, τὰς τε κληρονομίας ταῖς θυγατράσι
λείπουσιν, οὐ τοὺς υἱοὺς.

(Jac. 90F. 103k)

The Lycians offer more honour to women than to men, and they take their name from their mothers. Likewise they make their daughters not their sons their heirs.

Nikolaos thus goes one step further than Herodotos in claiming that inheritance also passed through the female line.

A further reference to a maternal form of identification in Lycia occurs in Plutarch, (*mul. virt.* 248D) who claims that the practice originated out of Bellerophon's conflict with the Lycians; it was instituted as a mark of honour for the women of Lycia who successfully prevailed upon Bellerophon not to take vengeance on their race for the attempts of their king Iobates to kill him.⁶¹

Further to the matrilineal question, a number of scholars have drawn attention to Sarpedon's pre-eminent status amongst the Lycians in Homeric tradition. Although Sarpedon shares the leadership of the Lycian contingent at Troy with his cousin Glaukos, the latter seems to be assigned a subordinate role. Note, for example, *Il.* 12. 101-04 where Glaukos is *chosen* by Sarpedon, leader of the allies, to be his companion (along with Asteropaeus); and note also Glaukos' reaction to his cousin's exhortation in *Il.* 12. 329, which again implies a position of subordination: "ὣς ἔφατ', οὐδὲ Γλαῦκος ἀπετρέπετ' οὐδ' ἀπύθησε. 'Thus spoke (Sarpedon), and Glaukos did not turn aside nor disobey him'. This implication is perhaps strengthened by Sarpedon's dying words to Glaukos in *Il.* 16. 492-501, which convey the impression of a leader handing over the command to his deputy.

The apparent differentiation in the status of the two Lycian leaders was first noted by the ancient commentators on Homer (Eustathius and the scholiast Townley, (*comms.* on *Il.* 12. 101) who saw in it a reflection of the honour paid to Sarpedon's mother Laodameia. And more recently scholars have interpreted the relative statuses of Sarpedon and Glaukos as an indirect indication of matrilineal descent; Sarpedon's grandfather Bellerophon inherited the kingship of Lycia

61. Note that Plutarch speaks of this practice in the past tense - i.e. as though it were defunct in his own day.

through his wife Laodameia, daughter of the previous king, and Sarpedon's supreme status was due to his descent from Bellerophon via his mother; Glaukos on the other hand was the son of Bellerophon's son Hippolochos, and thus his status was inferior to that of his cousin.⁶²

The 19th century scholar Bachofen incorporated such inferences in his elaborate and highly fanciful hypothesis on 'Mother Right' in Lycia (1861)⁶³ and in more recent years a number of scholars have accepted virtually without question that Lycian society was matrilineal;⁶⁴ it has even been stated quite categorically that it was matriarchal (Thomson, 1961/78, 99).

We should of course be careful to distinguish matrilineality from matriarchy, a distinction that is sometimes not clearly made or recognised by either ancient or modern scholars. Lycian society was certainly never matriarchal and we can confidently discount the claim made by Herakleides Pontikos that in Lycia it was the females who exercised control (*Müller FHG* 2. 217. 15).

But how firm is our evidence that Lycian society was *matrilineal*, if by this we mean that the Lycians named themselves after their mothers and their mothers' mothers, and that inheritance passed through the female line? What in fact does our evidence amount to? To begin with, we can attach little credence to the assumption that a matrilineal system is implicit in Sarpedon's genealogical relationships in the *Iliad*. There is absolutely no indication that the Lycians over whom Sarpedon and Glaukos ruled were regarded in Homeric tradition as a matrilineal people. Even if we accept that the *Iliad* does differentiate between the ranks of Sarpedon and Glaukos, and that the latter was in fact regarded as the subordinate of the former, it does not automatically follow that the Greeks saw in this differentiation the reflection of matrilineal succession. The claim that this kind of succession is implicit in Sarpedon's alleged supreme status in Lycia is a piece of pure

62. See, e.g. Monro, 1890, 313, n. on line 206, Immisch in Roscher, 1977, 406-07, Burn, 1930, 132, Tritsch, 1950, 498, n. 15, Wace and Stubbings, 1962, 306, Thomson, 1961/78, 165, Delcourt 1962-63.

63. Bachofen, 1861. See in general Treuber, 1887, 117-24.

64. E.g. Goetze, 1957, 181, Gurney, 1980, 102.

speculation, triggered off, no doubt, by the statements made about Lycian society in later times by Herodotos, Nikolaos, and Plutarch. As far as our literary sources are concerned, it is on these statements, and these alone, that the case for a matrilineal system in Lycia rests. To what extent, then, are we justified in assuming that they do provide us with valid evidence for such a system – at least from the 5th century onwards? The sepulchral inscriptions should provide the acid test if we accept that the provisions made for communal burials reflect existing family structures in Lycian society.

At first sight, the inscriptions appear to offer no support. The tomb owners are in all identifiable instances male,⁶⁵ it is they who decide who are, and who are not, to be buried in their tombs, and in the tomb families they delineate there is no immediately apparent evidence of a matrilineal system. On the other hand, we cannot be sure that when a tomb owner identifies himself by reference to one of his parents that the parent in question is always the father. In most cases it is not possible to tell whether the Lycian personal name is masculine or feminine, if we cannot determine this from contextual evidence or from corresponding Greek names in the bilingual texts. In later times there are in fact a number of examples of maternal identification in the Greek inscriptions of Lycia,⁶⁶ and a number of examples where a female is the property owner and provides a tomb for the burial of her family.⁶⁷

65. They can be so identified, for example, in cases where they make burial provision for their wives.

66. This applies both to tomb owners as well as to prospective tomb occupants, and to both males and females; e.g. TAM II 53 (son), 318 (daughter), 442 (s), 453 (d), 802 (d), 855 (d), 856 (d?), 886 (s), 955 (d), 984 (d), 992 (s), 998 (s?), 1000 (s), 1004 (d), 1014 (s), 1042 (s), 1045 (s), 1049 (s), 1053 (d), 1118 (s?) 1121 (d?), 1122 (s), 1130 (s?), 1132 (s?), 1135 (s?), 1142 (s?), 1148 (d), 1151 (d), 1162 (s?), SEG VI 740 (d), SEG VI 760 (d). It seems likely that in many of these cases the mother was of freed or slave status. There are also several instances in which a tomb owner identifies himself initially through his grandmother; e.g. TAM II 989, where Onesimos names his paternal grandmother Tatia.

67. E.g. TAM II 51, 165, 214, 322?, 323, 631, 692, 752? 802, 871?, 952, 955, 967?, 968, 975?, 984, 1013, 1022, 1046, 1080?, 1083? 1086, 1096, 1103, 1109, 1120, 1126, 1138?,

Even so, maternal identification is still far less common than paternal in the Greek inscriptions; and in any case maternal identification and female property ownership are not in themselves sufficient to prove a matrilineal family structure, nor are such features peculiar to Lycia in the Roman world. What this does indicate, however, is that the phenomenon referred to by Herodotos quite clearly did exist in Lycia in the Roman imperial period, and in view of his statement it may well have been a longstanding feature of Lycian society. It would be remarkable indeed to find Herodotos referring to a particular social phenomenon which did occur in Lycia, but not until several hundred years after he had written about it. Clearly we should probe a little further into the epichoric inscriptions.

Several of these inscriptions make reference to a group of eligible tomb occupants who are collectively designated as the *esedennew-* (a term of relationship) of a female – the tomb owner's mother (*eni*) in TL 89, and his grandmother (*khñna*) in TL 39, and probably also in TL 41 and 108.⁶⁸ This type of burial provision may have important implications, as illustrated by TL 39:

ebēññē : prñnawu me ti prñnawatē mēmruwi : khñtenubeh
tideimi hrppi esedeñnewi ; khñnahi ehbiehi ; se šurttāi
lada kbiyehis : meñne niyesu esedeñnewi : epttehi ;
ñtepi tane (lines 1-6).

This building Mēmruwi, son of Khñtenuba, has built (it) for the *esedeñnew-* of his grandmother and the wives of the šurttas Others however may not be placed within by their *esedeñnew-*.

1148, 1149. In all these cases the tomb owner identifies her children by reference to herself alone. Less commonly she identifies them by reference to both herself and her husband (e.g. TAM II 327, 887, 982, 1099, 1130, 1163), and very occasionally by reference to her husband alone (TAM II 451).

68. In the latter two cases the relevant sections of the text have to be almost completely restored – although the restorations that appear in Friedrich's text (*sesedeñnewi khññnahi* – TL 41.3, and *s[e esedeñnewi khññnah]i e[hb]iye[h]i* – TL 108.3-4) have generally been accepted; see, e.g. Laroche, 1957-58, 191, 1974, 141, and Houwink ten Cate, 1965, 142, n.2. It is of course possible that the texts should be restored differently – e.g. by replacing *khññnahi* with *khugahi* in both cases – i.e. 'for the *esedeñnew-* of his grandfather'.

The key word *esedeñnew-* has long been identified as the Lycian word for 'grandchild',⁶⁹ or more generally 'descendant', and is almost certainly Luwian in origin; Laroche has proposed for it the etymology **ashanta-nawa* - 'descendant by blood'.⁷⁰

But we need to consider in association with this another Lycian term of relationship - *khahba*, appearing several times in the inscriptions as a term of identification (TL 28. 4, 44 a 3-4 and 30-31, 83. 2), and also as a term designating a particular group of eligible tomb occupants (TL 74c. 5, 76. 1, 78. 5, 87. 5, 127. 2).⁷¹ *khahba* was long assumed to mean 'son-in-law' or 'daughter-in-law', or both, largely through a process of elimination, since most other terms of family relationship had already been identified and there was little else left. However, it now seems much more likely, on both etymological and contextual grounds, that *khahba* is the Lycian word for 'grandchild', and was probably also used in a more general sense to mean 'descendant'.⁷²

If so, we have two Lycian words to which the meaning 'grandchild/descendant' has been assigned, and we must suppose that there is a distinction of some kind between them.

Let us then reconsider the groups of people referred to as *esedeñnew-*. Since *esedeñnew-* seems commonly to have been attached to a female term of relationship, I have suggested elsewhere that it

69. See, e.g. Thomsen, 1899, 59-61, and more recently Houwink ten Cate, 1965, 91, n. e on TL 36, and 54, par. 3.

70. Laroche analyses *esedeñnewe* as *esede(n)* + *neve*, deriving *esede-* from Luwian **asha(n)-*, 'blood' (cf. Carruba, 1970, 32-33), and thus proposes for *esedeñnew-* the etymology **ashanta-nawa-*, 'descendant by blood' (1967, 62-63). See also Laroche, 1957-58, 191-92, and Neumann, 1969, 378, where Neumann suggests a possible derivation from Luwian **hassatanna-*.

71. Perhaps also N 302. 5 on the basis of a restoration proposed by Tritesch, originally in his paper presented at the Early Alphabets Conference, Manchester University, July 1975; see now Tritesch, 1975, 163.

72. See Bryce, 1978, 217-19, where *khahba* is discussed and reference is made to Hawkins' and Morpurgo-Davies' view that the Lycian word is derived from the Luwian term for grandchild *hamša-*. This view has recently been challenged by Hamp who accepts the meaning 'grandchild, descendant' for *khahba* but disputes the derivation from *hamša-* (1980).

perhaps had the specialised meaning 'descendant-in-the-female-line', a meaning which clearly has matrilineal significance; the tomb owner may be acknowledging this in his burial provisions in which he (or she) may be consciously trying to preserve in death a family's (putative) matrilineal structure. We may have a detailed illustration of such a scheme in one of the later Greek inscriptions of Lycia, TAM II 1184, in which the tomb owner (female in this case) makes burial provision for her sons, daughters, daughters' husbands and offspring, but explicitly excludes the offspring of her sons (see Bryce, 1978, 220-21).

There is, however, an alternative (and, I now believe, more likely) explanation for *esedeñnew-* - that it is a comprehensive term of relationship, embracing *khahba* and used in reference to members of a family unit who are related by blood ties, as distinct from marriage ties. This is suggested by the burial provisions which the tomb owner makes in TL 83 (the name of the owner is missing) where *esedeñnew-* occurs twice. The relevant words are underlined:

*mei ñtepi:ta[...]:epñ[tepli ppuweti tiyēi [khup]a
eb[ehi] alāma:se ladas [eb]ttehi[s:se] laññi:ebttehi
[es]edēñ[new]e:ñte meyepi:tadi:ti[k]e tik[e]:se iye
nepi:mñ[.]uhñti:ebeila:epñ khupa:ppu [..]weti tiyēi:
ebehi:tibe:esedeñnewe:ebttehi:tibe:laññi ebttehi:me
ne:tubidi:Trqqas:se itlehi:Trñmili:huwedri*

(lines 6-16)

'And [one will] place within hereand their wives and the *esedeñnewe* of their wives. If one places anyone (else) within either their *esedeñnewe* or (the *esedeñnewe*) of their wives, Trqqas (=Tarhunt) and the Lycian *huwedri* will punish him.'⁷³

The inscription (which as a whole is fragmentary and diverges in a number of ways from the standard forms of expression in the sepulchral

73. For various restorations and a suggested translation of the inscription as a whole, see Laroche, 1979b, 71.

texts) apparently makes provision for the burial of certain persons along with the *esedeñnew-* of their wives. Then in the clause which deals with unauthorised occupancy a distinction appears to be drawn between the *esedeñnew-* of those warned against violating the owner's instructions and the *esedeñnew-* of their wives. If this interpretation is correct, then the alternatives stated would clearly indicate that a husband and wife each had their own *esedeñnew-*; and such a distinction would only make sense if the term was used in reference to blood-relatives – an explanation which is certainly in keeping with the etymology (Luwian **ashanta-nawa*) proposed by Laroche.

But whether *esedeñnew-* refers to descendants in the female line or members of a family related by blood, the significant point for our present investigation is that a maternal or grandmaternal form of identification was sometimes used in the inscriptions to identify specific family groups. And it would be reasonable to suppose that a person belonging to such a group might identify himself individually by naming the female by whom the group as a whole was identified.

If so, then indirectly the epichoric inscriptions may provide *limited* support for the contention that on occasions the Lycians used, for one reason or another, a maternal form of identification during and prior to the period of the epichoric inscriptions, as they did in later times. but on this basis alone we can hardly claim that Lycian society was in general terms matrilineal, or that a matronymic form of identification occurred commonly in Lycia, passing from one generation to another, as Herodotos *et al.* would have us believe.

(c) *The term prñneziyehi and its possible matrilocal implications*

prñneziyehi is another term of relationship which we could consider within the context of the present discussion. In several inscriptions, the tomb owner identifies himself as the son (*tideimi*) of one person and the *prñneziyehi*⁷⁴ of another. TL 1 is a case in point:

74. The form *prñneziyehi* incorporates the adjectival suffix *-ehi-*. See Houwink ten Cate, 1965, 59-61, par. 5.

*ebēññē khupā me ne prñna <wa> tē khudali zuhriyah
tideimi khezrimēh prñneziyehi*

This tomb Khudali, son of Zuhriya, *prñneziyehi* of Khezrima/i, has built it.

prñneziyehi is equated with the Greek οἰκετοῦ in the bilingual TL 6, which enables us to translate the term as 'member-of-the- household'. There are four instances of this double identification formula in the sepulchral inscriptions (TL 1. 2, 6. 1-2, 116, 150. 1-3), and one further instance of it as a form of identification occurs in TL 28, an inscription on a commemorative monument in which the subject is identified as the daughter (*kbatra*) of one person, the wife (*lada*) of another, the grandchild (*khahba*) of a third, and member-of-the-household (*prñneziyehi*) of a fourth. We can conclude from this fourfold identification that someone who was classified as a member of a person's household was not, or at least need not have been, that person's lineal descendant.

Another inscription, TL 6, indicates that the tomb is the joint property of two owners, who are identified as members-of-the-household of a person called Purihimeti:

*ebēññē ñtatā me ne prñnawatē pulenyda mulliyesēh se
dapara pulenydah purihimetehe pr[ñ]neziyehi*

This chamber Pulenyda, (son) of Mulliyesi, and Dapara, (son) of Pulenyda, members-of-the-household of Purihimeti, have built it.

The introductory statement here *may* indicate that the relationship between Pulenyda and Dapara is that of father and son, each of whom had provided for the burial of his own immediate family. Of course there are other possibilities. But whatever the explanation, the tomb owners were concerned to express the attachment of themselves and their families to a particular household, of which Purihimeti was the

titular head. And it may well be that the tomb owners were not blood relatives of this person.

Attachment to a household could cover a range of possibilities, and perhaps within this range certain distinctions existed. We note in one of the Greek inscriptions where *οἰκεῖτο* occurs that the tomb owner provides for the burial of his *οἰκεῖτο* but distinguishes them carefully from the members of his immediate family (TAM II 82). Perhaps in some cases *prñneziyehi* also referred to members of a household who were distinct from the immediate family group, and may have included domestic retainers, servants, and/or slaves. And this must at least raise the possibility that certain tomb owners who identify themselves by the term *prñneziyehi* were of slave or similar status - as in certain Greek inscriptions, which indicate that a number of slaves and freedman owned their own tombs.⁷⁵

On the other hand tomb ownership was very much more restricted during the period of the epichoric inscriptions than it was in later times, and in all probability the owners of the 5th and 4th centuries were invariably people of social and political prominence, whose tomb families were for the most part limited to close family connections, as we have already noted. In some cases, of course, these could have been marriage connections, so that a household unit could have incorporated in-laws as well as blood-relatives. And this in turn opens up the possibility that in some cases it was the husband who joined his wife's family, and that the offspring of the marriage remained within the wife's family unit. In other words, some Lycian marriages may have been *matrilocal*.⁷⁶

Now if a tomb owner had become a member of his wife's family, he might well acknowledge this fact by identifying himself as 'belonging to the household of' the person who was regarded as the head of his wife's

75. E.g. TAM II 59, 627, 845, 941, 967, 986, 1005, 1020, 1023, 1026, 1028, 1032, 1044, 1150, 1156.

76. We might note, for the purposes of comparison, that *matrilocal* marriages are well attested for Hittite society where the term *antiyant-* (literally 'one entering into') is used of a man who enters into (i.e. becomes part of) the family of his wife. See most recently the discussion of Beal, 1983, 117-18, and note the parallels which Beal draws with other societies, 118, n. 23.

family. Thus the double identification (X, son of Y, member of the household of Z) would serve to indicate both the owner's natural father, as well as the household of which he was a member. I suggest that this may have been the case in TL 6.

(d) *Matrilineality and matrilocality: some tentative conclusions*

On the basis of all the above considerations, I think it likely that within particular family groups in Lycia a maternal form of identification was sometimes used during the epichoric period, and that the Lycians sometimes contracted *matrilocal* marriages. Are we able to find a satisfactory explanation for these features? Are they in any way connected?

Perhaps we could begin by considering the reasons a family might have for importing a son-in-law into the family structure. The most obvious explanation is that there was a shortage of males within the family line, and the importation of a son-in-law would help to offset this shortage. Conceivably it was in such a situation that *matrilocal* marriages were sometimes contracted in Lycia - a means of ensuring the continuance of the family line and obtaining a surrogate son, perhaps for the purpose of managing or working family estates, or undertaking other responsibilities normally carried out by a natural son.

But if the family in question was to retain its own distinct identity, if family property was to remain within the family, any inheritance or succession rights would have to pass through the blood-line, and be vested in a person who remained part of that family unit. And in cases where no males of the line were available, a female might then have been obliged to assume the role of titular head of a family group, and probably also of trustee of the family property, on the death of the previous head. This, I suggest, may be the reason, or one of the reasons, why in Lycia some family groups had females as their titular heads.

This line of reasoning presupposes that *matrilocality* and *quasi-matrilineality* were neither inherent nor consistently occurring features of the Lycian civilisation; rather they were *ad hoc* measures adopted in critical family situations when there was a shortage or absence of males of the line. Admittedly we have no *direct* evidence

that Lycian families were hard pressed in the ways I have suggested. But we could adduce parallels from other societies in which matrilocal marriages were contracted to offset shortages of males in the wife's family. We might note, for example, a number of instances in certain villages on the east coast of Scotland (especially between Craill and Leven) where in comparatively recent times families contracted matrilocal marriages to offset a high casualty rate amongst their male members who were drowned on fishing expeditions; and in such cases it was normal for the offspring of such marriages to assume their mother's rather than their father's family name.⁷⁷

Are there any indications that Lycian families suffered similar shortages of males? As we have seen in Chapter 4, during the period from the second half of the 6th century to the middle of the 4th century Lycia was on a number of occasions embroiled in military conflicts - which may well have had a substantial and sometimes devastating impact on many Lycian families. At the time of the Persian conquest, the population of Xanthos was decimated; in the early 5th century the Lycian contribution of 50 triremes to Xerxes' armada for the invasion of Greece was no doubt a further serious drain on the country's manpower; and then from the late 5th century to the middle of the 4th century Lycians were involved in a succession of conflicts, ranging from their participation in battles and skirmishes associated with the Peloponnesian War, to their military conflicts against each other, to their final participation on the losing side in the satrap rebellion. In times of continuing military activity, the adult male group is likely to be the most seriously affected part of the population; and in Lycia significant depletion of this group may well have caused the eventual disappearance of a number of families and brought others close to extinction. Perhaps

77. We might note also the practice of matrilineality and matrilocality in a much earlier period of Scottish history. I am grateful to Dr. Micheil MacDonald, Museum of Scottish Tartans, Comrie, Perthshire, Scotland, for the following comment: 'There is certainly a strong tradition in the early Celtic history of Scotland, and that relates principally amongst what are today called Picts, of matrilineal descent. These by definition involved a strong element of matrilocality. The territory of an heiress was adopted by a husband who afforded it his protection.'

it was in such a situation as this that certain families attempted to bolster their family lines by resorting to the measures suggested above.

We must of course be wary of the impression given by our Greek sources that matrilineality or even the use of a maternal identification formula was the rule in Lycia. What Herodotos, for example, has done is to fix upon a phenomenon which he may have observed or been informed of in a number of instances, but nowhere outside Lycia, and which he assumes to be applicable to the Lycian people as a whole. But while we may suspect him of giving a disproportionate emphasis to the phenomenon, it is most unlikely that he has completely misunderstood the Lycian family scene.

There can be no doubt that Lycian family structures were for the most part ordered along patriarchal and patrilineal lines, and that many Lycians, perhaps the great majority, identified themselves by reference to their fathers, as is the case in all demonstrable instances in the epichoric inscriptions. We certainly have no evidence of a regular matrilineal system in Lycia in the epichoric period, nor any evidence that matrilineality operated consistently from one generation to another within particular family units. All that is clear is that a maternal form of identification was sometimes used to identify a family group, and it is likely that in such cases the female referred to occupied a pre-eminent position within the group.

It is a matter of some regret that there is not more evidence in the epichoric inscriptions to support Herodotos' statement about the Lycians. But we cannot altogether overlook the possibility that what may have begun as an *ad hoc* measure in critical family situations did eventually become a more regular feature of Lycian society in later times, to the extent that it drew comment from writers some centuries after Herodotos first made mention of it. And it may be more than coincidental that a maternal form of identification is used in a number of Greek inscriptions of Lycia in the Roman imperial period, as we noted above.

As far as the related question of matrilocality is concerned, there is a possibility that the Greek inscriptions indicate, although in a very indirect way, a number of matrilocal marriages during the Roman period. The Greek inscriptions, which appear in increasing numbers from

the 3rd century B.C. onwards, make reference to a far larger range of potential tomb occupants, and a far more comprehensive assortment of relatives and family connections than is evident in the epichoric inscriptions. Moreover it is clear that by Roman times persons of all classes were in the privileged position of owning their own tombs, including freedmen and slaves, as mentioned above. Even so, the opportunities for owning a tomb must still have been very limited, and the actual proportion of tomb owners to the rest of the population may not have been appreciably higher in the Roman imperial period than it was some centuries earlier, given that the population of Roman Lycia was almost certainly very much larger. Perhaps then those persons who did own tombs came under increasing pressure, or felt an increasing sense of obligation, to grant burial rights to an ever-widening circle of family connections.

I have discussed elsewhere the various groups of family connections to whom an owner granted burial rights (spouse and children, parents, collaterals, in-laws, *threptoi*, slaves and freedmen) (Bryce, 1979a, 298-312), and will refer here only to the in-law group, with particular reference to parents-in-law. The inscriptions in which a tomb owner provided for the burial of his parents-in-law have, I believe, a close bearing on the matrilocal question.

These occur with approximately the same frequency as those in which a tomb owner provided for the burial of his natural parents. However, it is significant that one never finds instances of a tomb owner granting rights to both parents and parents-in-law in the same tomb.⁷⁸ One could offer various explanations to account for this; but in at least some instances a person who made burial provision for his wife's and not his own parents may have done so because he had become a member of his wife's family. If so this would be a further indication of some form of matrilocal system within the Lycian family structure.

Now presumably a marriage of this kind would have been advantageous both to the husband as well as to the family into which he married; presumably the husband could look forward to certain social or material benefits from such a union. Yet a man who granted burial rights to his in-laws took on, in this instance at least, the role of a provider of benefits for his wife's family rather than a recipient of

such benefits himself. And if we assume that the granting of burial rights to in-laws rather than to one's own natural family reflected a close affiliation between a husband and his wife's family, we are still left with the question of what incentives there were for the husband to enter into such an affiliation.

One possible answer is to be found in several inscriptions in which the tomb owner who provided for the burial of his parents-in-law is identified as a freedman or a slave (e.g. TAM II 845, 1005, 1044). In such cases a matrilocal-type marriage with a free woman might be of great advantage both to the husband as well as to the children of the union. Marriages between unfree males and free females were not uncommon in the Roman period (see Rawson, 1966, 74-78), and in such cases the offspring resulting from the union were classified as freeborn, regardless of whether their birth was considered legitimate or illegitimate (Rawson, 1966, 77). In such cases too, the children would very likely be regarded as members of their mother's family, for all legal and social purposes. When we consider also that the father in such a mixed union eventually gained his freedom (Rawson, 1966, 75), we can see a further possible incentive for his entering into it.

It is interesting to note that this system, which had widespread application in the Roman world, had apparently been operating in Lycia long before the Roman imperial period, to judge from Herodotos (1. 173). Herodotos claims that amongst the Lycians the child of an unfree male was classified as freeborn provided his/her mother was of free status. The reverse, however, did not apply; the child of an unfree female was of slave status regardless of the status of the father.

There is a further point we ought to note in considering the question of whether or not some Lycian marriages in the Roman imperial period

78. The only possible exception to this is TAM II 244, in which the owner provided for the interment of his father, his father-in-law, his stepmother(?), and his children(?) (the interpretation is not altogether clear). Apparently the tomb owner did not make provision for himself in the tomb. At all events, the eligible tomb occupants are an odd assortment of family connections, certainly not typical of any of the more usual types of tomb families.

were matrilocal. Although an owner commonly made provision for the burial of his wife's brothers and sisters, this never happened in cases where he provided for the burial of his mother-/father-in-law. There may have been several reasons for this; his parents-in-law may have had no other children, or alternatively their children may have married into other families or built tombs of their own. Whatever the explanation, it is clear that in this instance at least the son-in-law had assumed an important filial responsibility. And if in fact his wife's parents had no other children, there would obviously be some incentive on their part to obtain through their daughter's marriage a male who could act *in loco filii* and perhaps ensure the continuance of the family line.

The composition of the Lycian population

In view of the fact that from the late 6th century onwards Lycia was subject to a range of cultural and political influences, both Persian and Greek, we might ask to what extent our sources indicate foreign settlement in the country in the wake of the Persian conquest. Herodotos' account of the conquest (1.176) may have some bearing on this question. According to this account, the city of Xanthos was almost entirely repopulated after its destruction by "newcomers" (ἐπὶ ἡλῶδες). Who were these newcomers? Where did they originate?

It has been claimed, by Bernard (1964), that the destruction of the city must have been followed by an influx of Persians into Lycia, and that the Persians assumed a number of important administrative functions in the country. In support of this claim, Bernard refers to the appearance of three Persian names in the ephichoric inscriptions - Harpagos and the "dynasts" Mithrapata and Arttumpara. He refers also to a Mardonios, son of Aristomachos, attested in a decree of Apollonia in Lycia at the beginning of the 3rd century B.C., and to a number of persons with Persian names in the inscriptions of the Roman imperial period - Arsakes, Arsames, Artapates, Datamos, Mithrodates, Pharnakes. These persons, he claims, must have been distant descendants of Persians who had arrived in Lycia at the time of the Achaemenid empire, and who were assimilated into the Lycian community, and played an influential role in Lycian administrative and

political affairs (1964, 210-11; cf. Cook, 1983, 148, 177).

If Bernard's proposition has any substance, then we might expect to find a significant number of Persian names amongst the 30 or so dynasts/regional administrators who issued coins bearing their names, and amongst the hundreds of Lycian names known from the inscriptions of the epichoric period, both Lycian and Greek. To what extent is this the case?

Thanks to the comprehensive investigations which Schmitt has recently made of the Iranian names and words in the Lycian texts and coin legends (1982a and b), we are in a position to answer this question.

Schmitt has collected all the Iranian examples, both certain and doubtful, and divided them into three categories: (1) those for which the old Persian form is attested in the Achaemenid cuneiform texts; (2) those which can on other grounds be accepted as Iranian in origin; (3) those whose alleged Iranian origin is doubtful or hypothetical. For the purpose of our present investigation, it will be convenient to consider categories (1) and (2) together.

On the basis of Schmitt's investigations, we end up with a list of 24 names, hardly an impressive total if this is a reflection of the Persian element in Lycia during the epichoric period. But we significantly reduce this total if we take from it the names falling into the "Doubtful" category - i.e. those which may not be Iranian in origin. And from the names which are left we should then take those which belong to Persians or Persian officials who are obviously not resident in Lycia. This leaves us with a very small residue; and even in the case of the last remaining names, we cannot be sure that they belong in all cases to Persians resident in Lycia, or to Lycians with a Persian family background.

We must of course allow that there may have been a number of persons with Persian names living in Lycia who are not represented in our extant sources. Even so, we may reasonably assume that if there had been a substantial Persian presence in Lycia during the epichoric period Persian names would have figured much more prominently in the inscriptions and coin legends.

The overall situation can be summarised as follows:

A. Names of doubtful Iranian origin

1. Apñnātama - TL 87. 2; Schmitt, 1982a, no. 1.
2. Aruwātiyesi - TL 44 b 18, 41, M 137, 239; Schmitt, 1982a, 19, no. 7, 1982b, 385.
3. Ddeneweie - M 232; Schmitt, 1982a, 19-20, nos. 8-9, 1982b, 385-86.
4. Sppñtaza - TL 3. 2, M 128, 214; Schmitt, 1982a, 25, no. 21, 1982b, 386-87.
5. Urssme - TL 113. 1; Schmitt, 1982a, 25, no. 23; see also Schmitt, 1982b, 375, under Arssāma.
6. Wedewiē - M 148; Schmitt, 1982a, 27, no. 27, 1982b, 387.
7. Zakhabaha - M 134; Schmitt, 1982a, 28, no. 31, 1982b, 387.

B. Persians/Persian officials outside Lycia

1. Eriyamāna - TL 44 c 12; Schmitt, 1982a, 21, no. 11, 1982b, 379.
2. Ertakhssiraza - TL 44 b 59-60; Schmitt, 1982a, 21-22, no. 12, 1982b, 375.
3. Humrkhkha (= Lyc. B. Umrğa, Gk. Ἀρόργης; son of the satrap Πλοσούθης - TL 44 a 55, 44 c 49; Schmitt, 1982b, 379-80.
4. Kizzaprñna/Zisaprñna (= Gk. Τισσαφέρνης) - TL 44 c 1, 11-12, 14, 15; Schmitt, 1982a, 22-23, no. 14, 28, no. 32, 1982b, 380-81.
5. Ntariyeus- (= Gk. Ἀρεῖος) - TL 44 b 59; Schmitt, 1982a, 24, no. 19, 1982b, 376.
6. Utana (= Gk. Ὀτάνης) - TL 44 c 5; Schmitt, 1982a, 25-26, no. 24, 1982b, 376.
7. Wataprddate (= Gk. Ἀυτοφραδάτης) - TL 61. 2; Schmitt, 1982a, 26-27, no. 26, 1982b, 382.
8. Widrñna (father of Tissaphernes) - TL 44 c 11-12, and perhaps TL 44 c 2 ([Widrñna] he tideimi - "son of W."); Schmitt, 1982a, 27-28, no. 29, 1982b, 376.

C. Persons with Iranian names probably living in Lycia

1. Arppakhu (= Gk. Ἀρπαγός) - TL 44 a 30, 44 c 57-58, 77. 2b, N 310. 4; Schmitt, 1982a, 17-18, no. 2, 1982b, 377-78.
2. Arssāma - N 318a; Schmitt, 1982a, 18, no. 3, 1982b, 375.
3. Arttuñpara (= Gk. Ἀρτεμίδης) - TL 11. 3, 29. 7, 40 c 2-3 (?), M 231, 302; Schmitt, 1982a, 18-19, nos. 4-6, 1982b, 378.
4. Erbbina (= Lyc. B. Rbbine, Gk. Ἀρβίνος) - TL 44 a 25, TL 44 d 53, N 311. 1, Arbinas I and II; Schmitt, 1982a, 20-21, no. 10, 24, no. 20, 1982b, 378-79.
5. Magabata - N 310. 2; Schmitt, 1982a, 23, no. 15, 1982b, 381.
6. Mede - TL 29. 7,⁷⁹ 29. 11, 37. 3-4; Schmitt, 1982a, 23, no. 16, 1982b, 375-76.
7. Mithrapata/Mizrppata - TL 44 b 16, 64. 2, N 315. 2, M 138, 139; Schmitt, 1982a, 23-24, no. 17, 18, 1982b, 381-82.
8. Wekhssere/Wakhssere - M 132, 207, 208, 237; Schmitt, 1982a, 26, no. 25, 27, no. 28, 1982b, 381-82.
9. Wizttasppa (Lyc. B. form) - TL 44 c 48; Schmitt, 1982a, 28, no. 30, 1982b, 376-77.

We thus have a total of 9 clearly authentic Iranian names belonging to persons living in Lycia and attested in the inscriptions, the coin legends, or both. Of course the number of persons so named might be slightly larger than the number of names, since the same name may have been borne by more than one person. This applies, for example, to the

79. In TL 29. 7 the collocation arttuñpara medese occurs. In this context mede(se) is generally interpreted as an ethnic - "Arttuñpara the Mede" (thus Schmitt). Yet in TL 37. 3-4 Mede is clearly a personal name, the name of the tomb owner, as Schmitt notes. There is certainly no difficulty in accepting that an ethnic could sometimes be used as a personal name. I suggest that Mede in TL 29. 7 should also be construed as a personal name, particularly as it recurs without Arttuñpara, in line 11 of the same inscription. If so, then the -se which is attached to medese in line 7 is perhaps to be construed as an enclitic "and"; thus arttuñpara medese could be interpreted as two personal names (Arttuñpara and Mede) joined by "and". I have to admit, however, that there is no other clear evidence indicating that -se was in fact used enclitically in Lycian.

name Wekhssere, since almost certainly there was more than one coin issuer so called (to be dealt with in vol. II). On the other hand, some of the persons whose names appear in list C may not in fact have been permanent residents in Lycia. We can be reasonably sure that they were only if they appear to have had personal ties in the country. This applies to Arppakhu and Erbbina who were members of the ruling Xanthian dynasty, to Mede, a tomb owner, to Magabata, father of a tomb owner, and to the two persons called Wekhssere who were presumably family connections holding authority in Lycia at different periods. Yet even in the case of Arppakhu and Erbbina we cannot be entirely certain that they actually had a Persian family background. It is possible, that the Xanthian dynasty was partly of Persian descent, given the appearance of a Harpagos in the genealogy of the dynasty (see above, p. 46); but the dynasty may simply have adopted Persian names as a political gesture towards their Persian overlords. We cannot assume as a matter of course that they had blood-links with the conqueror of Xanthos.

As for the other names appearing in list C, Arttuñpara may have spent no more than a limited period in the country, perhaps as a Persian official temporarily installed there around the time of the satrap rebellion, and Mithrapata may also have been no more than a temporary resident in Lycia, an official of the Persian government. Arssāma is known only as the author of a brief dedicatory inscription,⁸⁰ and Wizttasppa appears only in an obscure passage of Lycian B.

The obvious conclusion to be derived from the above survey is that the epigraphic and numismatic evidence do not support the proposition of a significant Persian presence in Lycia following Harpagos' conquest of the country. One can hardly maintain that the Persian names which surface in the Roman imperial period belonged to distant descendants of Persians who settled in Lycia some centuries earlier when there is

80. Admittedly the name Arsames occurs in the later Greek inscriptions of Lycia, as we noted above. Possibly, then, the name does indicate a family line with Persian connections or of Persian origin going back to the epichoric period. But in the absence of other evidence the earlier and later occurrences of the name in Lycia may be purely coincidental.

virtually no trace of such persons in the records of that time. If, as Bernard claims, the Persians belonged to families of longstanding influence and distinction, the records of the earlier period would surely give us a clearer indication of their existence.

It is interesting, and instructive, to compare with the above the evidence we have for Greeks in Lycia during the epichoric period. The following table indicates references to persons with Greek names appearing in either the epigraphic or the numismatic sources, or both.⁸¹

No.	Greek name	Lyc. name	Ref.	Remarks
<i>Group A: Tomb owners or members of tomb owners' families</i>				
1.	Ἀπολλωνίου	Pulenyda	TL 6. 4, 5	tomb owner; father & son have Lyc. names.
2.*	Ἰητροκλής	Iyetrukhle	TL 38. 3	tomb owner.
3.*	Καλλιόναξ	Kheliyāñakh-ssa	TL 116. 2	head of the household of which the tomb owner (name fragmentary) a member.
4.*	Κυπρίας	Khupriya	TL 78. 1	tomb owner, other family members have Lyc. names.
5.*	Λύσανδρος ⁸²	Lusāñtra	TL 103. 2	member of tomb family?
6.*	Λύσανδρος	Lusātra	TL 90. 2	member of tomb family?

81. This list incorporates Houwink ten Cate's list of Greek names and their transliterated Lycian forms, 1965, 105.

82. The three inscriptions containing Lycianised forms of the Greek name Lysander are all sepulchral, although in each case the context in which the name occurs is unclear. It is possible that the same person is referred to in all three inscriptions.

No.	Greek name	Lyc. name	Ref.	Remarks
7.*	Λύσανδρος	Lusñtre	TL 104a 2-3	member of tomb family?
8.*	Μοσχᾶς	Muskhkha	TL 93. 1	father of tomb owner with Lyc. name.
9.*	Εανθῆας	Khssēñziya	TL 91. 1	father of tomb owner with Lyc. name.
10.*	Εανθῆας	Khssēñziya	TL 150. 1, 8	tomb owner; father has Lyc. name.
11.	Παρμένων	Parm[ēna]	TL 117. 2	father of Σιδάριος; see below.
12.	Σιδάριος	Sideriya	TL 117. 2	tomb owner; father has Gk. name, son has Lyc. name.
13.*	Στομᾶς	St[a]maha	TL 127. 1	tomb owner; father has Lyc. name.
14.*	Στολῆς	Sttuli	TL 88. 1	father of tomb owner with Lyc. name.
15.*	Τερψικλῆς	Terssikhle	TL 149. 2	father of tomb owner with Lyc. name.

Group B: Persons named in family monuments

16.	Θρύψυς	Kruppsi	TL 25a. 2	father of Πόρπαξ; see below.
17.*	Μεγιστής	Mekhistte	TL 27. 1	author of monument; father, wife, son have Lyc. names.

No.	Greek name	Lyc. name	Ref.	Remarks
18.	Πόρπαξ	Khssbeze ⁸³	TL 25a. 2	author of monument; father has Gk. name, uncle & wife Lyc. names.

Group C: Citizen of Lycian town

19.	Δημοκλεΐδης	Ñtemukhlida	N 312. 1	citizen of Limyra.
-----	-------------	-------------	----------	--------------------

Group D: Coin-Issuers

20.*	Ἀθηναγόρας	Tēnegure	M 217	coin-issues to be dated c. mid-5th C.
21.	Περικλῆς	Perikle	M 148-50 TL 67 etc.	Lyc. <i>khñtawata</i> .

Group E: Officials appointed by Pixodaros

22.	Ἀπολλόδοτος	Natrbbiyēmi ⁸⁴	N 320. 3-4	archon
23.	Ἀρτεμηλῆς	Erttimeli	N 320. 5	epimeletes
24.	Ἰερων	Iyera	N 320. 3	archon
25.	Σειμῆας	(E)seimiya	N 320. 8, 9-10	priest of newly established cult.

Group F: "Foreign Greeks"

26.*	Ἀλέξανδρος	Alakhssa[ñ]tra	TL 29. 9	Alexander the Great?
------	------------	----------------	----------	----------------------

83. *Khssbeze* is probably a "translation" of the Greek name; see Chapter 3, n. 111.

84. Again a translation of the Greek name; see below, p. 187.

No.	Greek name	Lyc. name	Ref.	Remarks
27.*	Μελέσανδρος	Milasāntra	TL 44 a 45	Athenian commander.

Group C: Uncertain

28.	Μέσος	Mizu	TL 32 d & s	
-----	-------	------	-------------	--

The asterisked names appear in the texts only in their Lycianised versions.

The majority of the names in this list clearly belong to persons who were permanently settled in Lycia. This is particularly evident in the largest group (A) which consists of tomb owners and members of tomb owners' families. But we can also include in the resident category the persons in Group B, who had set up family monuments in Lycia, Demokleides in Group C, who identifies himself as a citizen of Limyra, and the coin-issuers Tēnegure and Perikle in Group D. In Group E I have listed the officials whom the Carian satrap Pixodaros appointed in Lycia at the time the cult referred to in the Letoon trilingual was established. We cannot be certain whether the first three persons mentioned - Apollodotos, Artemelis, and Hieron - were already inhabitants of Lycia before their appointment, or whether they were outsiders introduced by Pixodaros into the country's administrative hierarchy. However Simias, the priest appointed to oversee the cult, almost certainly belonged to a local Lycian family since his father bore a Lycian name (Qñturaha-). And we note that Simias' appointment was to be an hereditary one, to be passed on through his family line - a further indication that his family were, or were to become, settled inhabitants of the country.

Even so, the name Simias very likely indicates that the Lycian priest's family was Greek in origin, or at least had Greek elements in its background. And a similar situation may well have applied to a number of the persons with Greek names listed in Groups A and B; in several cases we find fathers with Greek names whose sons have Lycian names

(nos. 8, 9, 14, 15), in several others, sons with Greek names whose fathers have Lycian names (nos. 1, 13, 17). In one of these cases, no. 17, the son and the wife as well as the father of the person in question (Mekhistte) have Lycian names, the son being called Skkhuliye after his grandfather. We might also note two cases in which both father and son have Greek names - no. 11, Parmenon, son of Sidarios, and no. 18, Porpax, son of Thrupsis. In both these cases, however, other members of the family have Lycian names - Sidarios has a son called Pubiele, Porpax an uncle called Purihimeti.

Clearly, then, there was an admixture of Greek and Lycian family-names in a number of family-groups. What conclusions can we draw from this? While it is possible that Greek names were occasionally assumed by Lycians of purely indigenous stock,⁸⁵ we might reasonably suppose that most if not all of the families referred to above were in part at least of Greek origin.⁸⁶ And quite conceivably some of these families had already been settled in Lycia for several generations before their appearance in the epichoric inscriptions.

When comparing the lists of Persian and Greek names appearing in our Lycian sources, the significant point to emerge is that not only are the Greek names more numerous than the Persian, but in contrast to the Persian clearly belong in the majority of cases to settled inhabitants of Lycia. On this basis, it would seem likely that the Greek element in the Lycian population was rather more substantial than the Persian element during the epichoric period.

Even so, the Greek names represent only a small proportion of the total number of personal names attested in our sources for this period. The overwhelming majority of these names are of indigenous origin, and as such provide a strong argument against any suggestion that Greeks - or Persians - settled in Lycia in significant numbers during the epichoric period.

What credence, then, can we attach to Herodotos' statement that Xanthos was largely repopulated by 'newcomers' after its destruction in

85. The Lycian Perikle may well fall into this category.

86. Very likely the admixture of names in a number of Lycian families was the result of marriage unions between persons of Greek and persons of indigenous origin.

the 6th century? The newcomers are certainly not distinguishable in our epigraphic, numismatic, or literary sources. This could well mean that if new settlers did come to the city they were of local or relatively local origin; and if so they probably came from areas which had close cultural affinities with the old Xanthian population (cf. Treuber, 1887, 93-94).

I have suggested in chapter 4 that at the time of the Persian conquest the territory recognised as Lycia was confined essentially to the Xanthos valley. Communities lying outside this area, even within the confines of the region we generally refer to as Lycia, might well have been regarded as 'foreign' communities at this stage in Lycia's development. Perhaps Telmessos was a case in point. We know from the Athenian Tribute Lists that in the middle of the 5th century Telmessos was still reckoned as politically separate from Lycia, though its population, as indeed the populations of the nearby Carian communities, may well have had close ethnic and cultural connections with the population of the Xanthos valley - connections going back to the original settlement of the Termilae in the south-west corner of Asia Minor. If we can accept Herodotos' statement at face value, communities like these, along with other local communities which may later have been incorporated into Lycian territory, were in my view the most likely source of the new settlers in Lycia. Had the city been resettled by a large alien population, we would certainly expect to find evidence of this in our sources.

I have concluded above that the majority of persons of foreign background living in Lycia during the epichoric period were probably Greek in origin. It is possible, however, that there was a small influx of Persians into the country in the wake of the satrap rebellion, when the old system of regional administrators was abandoned and a new and more tightly controlled administrative system was established, under the immediate control of the Carian satraps of the Hekatomnid line; in this period Lycia probably lost much of the *de facto* independence it had previously enjoyed under Persian rule.

Unfortunately the post-rebellion inscriptions give no explicit evidence of Persian names (except for Arttūmpara who appears to have been reinstated in the country after having previously been driven from it by Perikle before or during the rebellion) (see above, pp. 112-13). The

only explicit evidence we have for a person of Persian background living in Lycia at this time occurs in the literary references to a man called Pharnakes whom Alexander took to Persia as an interpreter. Pharnakes was a Lycian with a Persian name, he could speak Persian, and he had a Persian mother.⁸⁷

We might also note here the references in the trilingual to a group of persons living within the district of Xanthos but apparently without full citizenship status. In the Lycian text these persons are designated as *epewētliūmēi*, and are clearly distinguished from the *arus*, the citizen body of Xanthos.⁸⁸ The distinction occurs also in the Greek text, where the *epewētliūmēi* are designated as *perioikoi* and the *arus* as *xanthioi*.⁸⁹ And a similar distinction between *perioikoi* and citizen body is also attested both at Limyra and Telmessos in several inscriptions of the 3rd century B.C.⁹⁰

What is the basis of the distinction? It has been suggested that *epewētliūmēi/perioikoi* may in these contexts refer to a resident alien population living within the district of the city in question but lacking full citizenship rights.⁹¹ And if so the term may indicate a relatively new social phenomenon in Lycia, reflecting the growth of foreign settlement in the country during the 4th and early 3rd centuries B.C. On this assumption the *perioikoi* were newcomers to the country who had yet to be absorbed within the fabric of Lycian society as fully fledged citizens.

87. See Diodoros 17. 68. 4-7, Plutarch, Alex. 37. 1-2, Quintus Curtius 5. 4. 10-13, Arrian 4. 3. 7.

88. *arus:seyepewētliūmēi* (line 6); cf. lines 13-14 and 31-31, where the term *arus* is replaced by *teteri* ("townspeople"). On *arus*, see Carruba, 1979, 89-91, Laroche, 1979b, 62-63.

89. Lines 5-6, 27-28. On line 12 of the Greek text, see Hahn, 1981, 53-54, with n. 15.

90. From Limyra, an inscription dating to 288/87 B.C. in the reign of Ptolemy I (see Wörle, 1977); from Telmessos, an inscription dating to 279 B.C. in the reign of Ptolemy II (see Wörle, 1978). Wörle cites also a second possible example from Telmessos, a fragmentary inscription dating to 258/56 B.C. and honouring Leimon, son of Antipater (1978, 237, with n. 189). Metzger suggests that the distinction disappeared towards the middle of the 3rd century, since there is no reference to *perioikoi* in the inscriptions of later date (1979, 37).

91. Cf. Bryce, 1978-79, 121-22, Childs, 1981, 57.

However, a more plausible explanation of the distinction is that it differentiated between an urban citizen-body and a peripheral rural population, as proposed by both Wörrle and Hahn. In Wörrle's view the term *perioikoi* in a Lycian context refers to a non-urban population, living in the district attached to a particular city, but outside the city proper; but while the occupants of the city and the *perioikoi* were two distinct groups, they nonetheless had constitutional and legal equality, and together they formed the polis (Wörrle, 1978, 236-46). More recently, Hahn has argued that the differences between the *perioikoi* and the city population were rather more marked. Basically, he argues, the *perioikoi* were a native, non-urban, non-Hellenised population, distinguishable from a city population which was also partly Lycian in language and culture but had become more or less Hellenised. The *perioikoi* were not members of the polis, they lacked the property qualifications and the political and legal status of full citizens, and they had no inalienable rights over the land they occupied. Nevertheless they were free and independent, and took part in any decision-making which concerned the land where they were settled. (Hahn, 1981, 55-56 in particular.)

We are still left with the question of when and how the distinction between citizen body and *perioikoi*, with its various legal and practical implications, came about. Although the Letoon trilingual is the first document that makes mention of it, the distinction may have been a longstanding one, and was perhaps originally associated with the rise of a powerful new aristocracy at Xanthos in the 6th century, following in the wake of the rebuilding of Xanthos after its destruction by the Persians (cf. Hahn, 1981, 61, n. 49). On the other hand, the precise formal status which the distinction seems to have had in the inscriptions referred to above may have been, in part at least, the outcome of administrative developments and the growth of urban institutions in Lycia during the 4th and 3rd centuries B.C. - to a large extent, perhaps, under Hellenic influence.⁹²

92. This is particularly likely if, as Hahn suggests, the urban population of the cities in question had become largely Hellenised during the 4th century.

Whatever the precise distinction between citizen body and *perioikoi* may have been, and whenever the distinction originated, we cannot exclude the possibility that from at least the 4th century onwards the *perioikoi* included a number of persons of foreign as well as of indigenous origin. However, I think it unlikely that foreigners, whether Greek or Persian, settled in Lycia in substantial numbers until the post-Alexander period, from the late 4th century B.C. onwards, when the Lycian urban centres, especially the coastal cities, developed a more cosmopolitan character. This may have been due in part to Alexander's policy of racial fusion, but in any case Lycia became increasingly subject to the political, military, and commercial interests of a range of foreign powers, both Near Eastern and Greek, from this time onwards. This, I believe, provides the most appropriate setting for a substantial increase in the population of Lycia. And foreign settlers may well have included some Persians who involved themselves in the administrative and burgeoning commercial affairs of the country.

But the most substantial numbers of new settlers were Greek. As the Greek inscriptions of Lycia indicate, the Greek population of the country increased markedly in the centuries following the epichoric period, the thousands of Greek names in the inscriptions far outweighing the small number of Lycian, Persian, and other foreign names. And it is noteworthy that in the 1st century B.C. Cicero, who had some direct knowledge of the Lycians - there were Lycians in his army during his governorship of Cilicia - refers to them as a Greek people (*Verr.* 4. 10. 21). On the other hand, elements of the indigenous civilisation persisted in the country throughout the Roman imperial period. And the overwhelming continuity that we see in Lycian burial customs very likely points to the continuation of a native population even if under heavy Greek influence.

By the 4th century B.C. the Lycians had established cults and centres of worship for a wide range of deities who had come to be associated with their country at different times, and for different reasons. The majority of these deities seem to have had their roots in Bronze Age Anatolia. Yet under the growing influence of Hellenism, from the late 5th century onwards, the Anatolian origin of many of them was gradually obscured as they came to be equated and merged with Greek counterparts. In addition, the list of gods and goddesses worshipped in the country was increased by the introduction of a number of new deities, again mainly Greek in origin, who as far as we know had no counterparts among the indigenous deities.

We are unable to determine from our sources whether the Lycians thought of the deities they worshipped as members of an organised pantheon in which each deity had his or her special place and was endowed with specific functions and attributes. This is of course largely due to the limitations of the surviving evidence. In fact our knowledge of the roles and functions of the various deities is confined largely to the information provided by the sepulchral inscriptions in which gods and/or goddesses are commonly assigned a role as tomb protectors called upon by the tomb owner to punish anyone guilty of violating his instructions (see above, pp. 123-25).

We can, however, identify with reasonable certainty the deities who appear to have been most prominent in Lycia, on the basis of the frequency with which their names occur in the inscriptions, the extent of the distribution of their cult centres throughout the country, and perhaps also their identification with prominent Bronze Age Anatolian or Classical Greek deities. Various examples will be given in the discussion below.

But there is little indication in our sources of any overall national organisation of Lycian cults and religious practices. While the Letoon may have served as a type of religious focal point for the country as a whole (cf. Bryce, 1983a, 12), the worship of most deities was closely tied to the local cult centres. A particular deity may have been worshipped in several different centres, but in each centre he or she was regarded as belonging specifically to that centre or to the district in which the

centre was located.¹

On the other hand, we do find references in several of the sepulchral inscriptions to a group of deities whose sphere of interest and influence may have been somewhat more wide-ranging - namely the *māhāi huwedri*, who are called upon to punish tomb violators. Unfortunately the precise meaning of *māhāi huwedri* has yet to be established; out of context *māhāi*, the Lycian word for "god" or "gods", can be either a nominative or genitive form, singular or plural,² and we can only guess at the meaning of *huwedri*. The translations generally favoured for the phrase are "the confederate gods", "the assembly of the gods", "all the gods".³ If any of these translations are correct, then the expression may indicate that there was in fact a Lycian council of gods, or that on some occasions at least the Lycian gods did act in concert.⁴ Alternatively, the *māhāi huwedri* may have been a particular group of deities concerned primarily with matters of death and burial, like the θεοὶ (κατα)χθόνιων of the Greek inscriptions of Lycia.⁵ Perhaps this was one category of Lycian deities who did have a specific function. But all interpretations of *māhāi huwedri* are at present purely conjectural.

1. This is indicated by such expressions as *ēni qlahi ebiyehi* - "the mother (goddess) of this sanctuary(?)" (TL 26. 24 etc.), *maliyahi wedrēñnehi akhātaza* - "priest of the regional Maliya" (TL 149. 2).
2. See Houwink ten Cate, 1965, 94, n. g on TL 57.
3. Cf. Houwink ten Cate, *ibid.*, Laroche, 1967, 56. The suggestion, referred to by Houwink ten Cate, that *māhāi* is in this context to be construed as gen. plur. dependent on *huwedri* (construed as a substantive) was made originally by Meriggi (e.g. 1928, 446, 1963, 11), followed by Carruba (e.g. 1969, 79). It is much more likely, however, that *huwedri* is an adjective qualifying *māhāi* (construed as a nom. plur.), as Heubeck has recently demonstrated (1982, 109).
4. We sometimes find deities associated with each other as disciplinary agents in the penalty clauses of the sepulchral inscriptions; e.g. TL 80. 3: *me ne [trq]as tubidi se maliya eriyupama* - 'Trqqas and eriyupama Maliya will punish him (i.e. the offender against the tomb owner's instructions)'.
5. E.g. TAM II 51. 55, 218, 228, 451, 452, 521, 613, 637, 692, 927, 1028, 1081, SEG I 467. See also Carruba, 1970, 37, n. 24.

The deities worshipped in Lycia and attested in the inscriptions of the epichoric period can for convenience' sake be grouped in the following five categories:

Category 1: Deities of Bronze Age Anatolian origin

- (a) *ēni mahanahi* ("mother of the gods")/*ēni qlahi ebiyehi* ("mother of this sanctuary(?)") = Bronze Age Luwian *annis māššanaššiš*, and subsequently equated with Leto (TL 26. 24, 56. 4, 65. 24(?), 94. 3, 102. 3, 110. 5, 112. 6, 131. 3, 145. 4).
- (b) *Trqqas* (Lycian B *Trqqiz*) = Bronze Age Tarhunt (the Storm God); perhaps later equated with Zeus (Solymeus) (TL 80. 3, 83. 15-16, 88. 6, 93. 3).
- (c) *Maliya*; later equated with Athene (TL 26. 12, 44 a 43, 44 c 5 and 7, 75. 5, 76. 5, 80. 3, 149. 2 and 12, 150. 6).
- (d) the *tesēti*, the 'oath gods', comparable with the Hittite *linkiāntes* (TL 135. 2, 149. 10).

Category 2: Deities of possible Bronze Age Anatolian origin

- (a) *Qeli* (N 322).
- (b) *Trzzubi* (TL 111. 1 and 4).
- (c) The *Eliyāna* (N 320. 40).
- (d) The *Twelve Gods* (TL 44 c. 22).
- (e) *Kakasbos* (e.g. TAM II 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13).

Category 3: Deities of Greek origin

- (a) *Leto*, identified with the *ēni mahanahi* (1a above).
- (b) *Athene*, identified with *Maliya* (1c above).
- (c) *Artemis* (Lycian form *Ertemi*) (TL 44 c 8).
- (d) *Aphrodite* (Lycian form *Pedrita/Padrita*) (TL 44 b 33, N 307).
- (e) *Apollo*, implicitly attested in N 320. 39.
- (f) *Zeus*, attested in the poetical form *Zēn* (TL 44 c 30).

Category 4: Deities of Carian origin

- (a) *Khñtawat- Khbidēñn-* = Βασιλεὺς Καύνου (TL 44 c 8-9, N 320. 7-8, 17-18, 23-24).
- (b) *Arkazuma* = Ἀρκεσμάς (N 320. 8, 18, 24, 25).

Category 5: Other possible Lycian deities

- (a) *Natri-* (TL 44 c 33, 44 c 48).
- (b) *Hppñterus* (TL 58. 8, 139. 4).
- (c) *Eheti* (TL 44 b 48).
- (d) *Ddewezi* (TL 65. 24).
- (e) *(E)heledi* (N 306. 4, 309c. 4-5).
- (f) *Khba* (TL 44 a 44, 102. 4, 106. 2, N 309c. 6).
- (g) *Tesñmi* (N 309c. 7).
- (h) *Rñma-* (see, e.g., TL 121. 1).
- (i) *Ia-* (see, e.g., TL 149. 2).

Discussion

Category 1: Deities of Bronze Age Anatolian origin

(a) *ēni mahanahi* - "mother of the gods". The goddess can be directly identified with the Late Bronze Age Luwian goddess *annis māššanaššiš*, a name which also means 'mother of the gods' and which as Laroche points out actually represents letter for letter the Lycian *ēni mahanahi* (1958, 190; cf. Laroche 1980, 1 and 3). The Luwian goddess may well have been introduced into Lycia some time after the end of the Bronze Age by the Lukka people who, I have suggested, were one of the major population components of the Lycian people. At all events, the Lycian goddess clearly reflects the continuation of the Anatolian mother goddess tradition whose roots almost certainly extend back before the beginning of the Bronze Age.

The goddess is commonly referred to elsewhere in the epichoric inscriptions as *ēni qlahi ebiyehi* - mother of this sanctuary(?), and under this title she is twice equated with the goddess Leto; the inscriptions in question are the bilingual TL 56 (line 4) and the trilingual N 320 (line 38 of the Lycian version, corresponding to line 34 of the Greek).

It may also be that Leto is referred to under her own name in the epichoric texts. Two possibilities have been suggested: (a) In TL 44 b 61 the words *ade mē:leññi qla* are translated by Laroche "et il a fait l'enceinte de Lēto" (1979b, 114, 1980, 3-4). Laroche analyses the form *leññi* as **let(a)-hi > *lethi* written as *leññi*; (b) In N 306. 4 and N 309c. 4 the form *lātāi* occurs, which Gusmani explains as the

Lycian form of Leto's name (1963, 289ff., followed by Neumann, 1979b, 25). If correct, these identifications may indicate that Leto originally had a cult in Lycia separate from that of the mother goddess. But both identifications must be regarded as highly conjectural, and in any case they do not significantly alter our picture of Leto as a Greek goddess who took over the cult of an indigenous mother goddess in Lycia by the late 5th or early 4th century B.C.

Leto's initial link with Lycia may have arisen simply from an observed resemblance between certain characteristics attributed to her in the Greek world and those of the indigenous Anatolian mother goddess represented by the Lycian *ēni mahanahi* and *ēni qlahi ebiyehi*. Yet in Greco-Roman literary tradition she was given a firm place in Lycian mythology and closely associated with the sanctuary near the city of Xanthos now known as the Letoon. The best known of the literary sources is Ovid, *met.* 6. 316-81 which relates that Leto, in flight from the wrath of Hera, came to rest by a lake in Lycia with her baby children Apollo and Artemis. A similar account is given by Servius in his commentary on Vergil's *Georgics* (1. 378). The tradition can be traced back at least to the 4th century B.C. since Antoninus Liberalis (*met.* 35) repeats the story in a succinct form and cites the 4th century Hellenistic writer Menekrates of Xanthos and the 3rd century Nikander of Kolophon as his sources. There can be little doubt however that Leto's cult centre on the Xanthos river dates to a much earlier period than this.⁶

Ovid is quite explicit in attributing the origin of the sanctuary to the Greek newcomer, but it is more likely that the Letoon was first associated with the cult of an early Anatolian goddess of Luwian origin with whom Leto came to be identified under Greek influence. Perhaps a faint reflection of this is to be found in the commentary of the 6th century A.D. scholar Stephanus Byzantinus. In explaining the non-Greek word *Syessa* (s.v.) Steph. Byz. claims that it is a hut in Lycia that

6. Deposits of ceramic ware datable to the 6th century B.C. indicate that the sanctuary already existed at this time (see most recently Metzger, 1979, 26-28), i.e. at least two centuries before reference is made to it in the written records, and there may well be remains of earlier buildings yet to be unearthed on the site.

derives its name from an old woman Syesse who had given shelter to Leto. It may be that Steph. Byz. is indirectly preserving an authentic tradition whereby the Greek cult of Leto took over from an indigenous cult already established in the area.⁷

I have referred earlier to the statue base with four inscriptions unearthed by the French at the Letoon in 1973, and datable to the early 4th century (see pp. 43-44). The inscription on face A, which I have designated as *Erbina II*, indicates that the statue was set up by *Erbina* in honour of Leto. This may be the earliest surviving reference we have to the goddess in Lycia - unless of course she appears in the epichoric texts as *lātāi* or *le 99 i*.

(b) *Trqqas* (Lyc. B *Trqqiz*). The Lycian god *Trqqas* can be directly equated with the Luwian Storm God *Tarhunt*, the chief god of the Late Bronze Age Luwian pantheon.⁸ In addition to figuring as a disciplinary agent in several of the sepulchral inscriptions, the god also appears in several passages in the Xanthos stele inscription, which probably reflect his importance in Xanthos as well as in Lycia in general; for example, TL 44 b 51-52:

se dde tuwetē:kumeziya: tere tere trqqnti:pddātahi

"and he has erected altars everywhere (?) to *Trqqas* of the *pddāt*."⁹

Tarhunt/Trqqas is the basis of the personal name *Trokondas* which occurs quite frequently in the Greek inscriptions of eastern Lycia, Pisidia, and Lykaonia. According to Houwink ten Cate, Zeus Solymeus, the chief god of this region in Greco-Roman times, is simply the old Anatolian deity *Tarhunt* in another guise (1965, 202).

(c) *Maliya*. The goddess *Maliya*, whose name provides the root of many personal and place names in Hittite and other texts of the 2nd and 1st millennia B.C.,¹⁰ was apparently one of the most prominent of the

7. For a more detailed discussion of Leto in Lycia, see Bryce, 1983a. See also Laroche, 1980, 4.

8. See Laroche, 1958, 96-99, 1959, 127, 1979, 115, and 1980, 3. See also Neumann, 1979, 261, and (on the form of the name) Meriggi, 1980, 220-21, sec. 16.

9. For the interpretation, cf. Laroche, 1967, 58 and 61. On the form *pddāt*-, see Laroche, 1979, 61.

10. See Barnett, 1974, 900-01, and the references cited therein, and Neumann, 1967, 34-35, 1970, 16. As Laroche

Lycian deities, to judge from the frequency with which her name occurs in the inscriptions (see Neumann, 1967, 34-38). A cult in her honour at Xanthos is indicated in the Xanthos stele inscription where reference is made to her *temenos* (TL 44 c 5), which she apparently shared with Artemis and the "Lord of Kaunos" (*Khñtawata Khbidēñni*, discussed below) (TL 44 c 7-8). She is also mentioned in inscriptions from eastern Lycia (TL 149, 150) where the cult of Athene Polias flourished in later times.¹¹

We can equate Maliya with the Greek goddess Athene on the basis of an inscription and a scene appearing on a double-head silver vase dating (probably) to the first half of the 4th century B.C. The scene depicts the judgment of Paris, and features three figures - Aphrodite, Athene, and Paris - with their names inscribed next to them in Lycian characters. Athene is represented by the name *Mal[i]ya*.¹²

We note too that Athene figures in the Greek epigram on the east side of the Xanthos stele (translated above, pp. 97-98), where she is associated with the military successes of the author of the inscription in her role as "Sacker of Cities" (TL 44 c 26).

(d) The *tesēti*. On two occasions the penalty clauses of the sepulchral inscriptions make reference to the Lycian oath-gods - the *tesēti trmili* (TL 135. 2 and 149. 10). The interpretation of *tesēti* as "oath-gods" was originally suggested by Houwink ten Cate who compared them to the Hittite oath-gods, the *linkilantes*,¹³ who are called upon to punish vassal rulers guilty of violating treaties drawn up with their Hittite overlords. In the Lycian inscriptions, the tomb owners invoke the oath-gods to protect their tombs by the threat of retribution against tomb violators.

points out (1980, 4), the deity Maliya is frequently attested in the 2nd millennium Hittite texts, but the texts give no precise information about the characteristics or functions of the deity at this time.

11. Cf. TAM II 924, 1184, and 1200, and see Hawkins in the appendix to Barnett, 1974, 902, and Laroche, 1979b, 115.

12. Details of the vase have been published by Strong, 1964, 95-102, and more recently by Barnett, 1974, 893-901. The inscription now appears in Neumann, 1979b, as N 307.

13. Houwink ten Cate's suggestion is cited by Bryce, 1976a, 186.

Category 2: Deities of possible Bronze Age Anatolian origin

(a) *Qeli*. An inscription recently discovered in Pinara by Zahle has produced the name of an otherwise unknown deity Qeli. The inscription, now designated by Neumann as N 322, is sepulchral and refers to the tomb owner as the priest (*kumaza*) of Qeli. Neumann suggests that the name has a Bronze Age pedigree, observable in the personal name *Kila-muwa*,¹⁴ and considers the possibility of a link with *Halki*, the Hittite name of the grain goddess.

(b) *Trzzubi* appears in the sepulchral inscription TL 111 as the deity in whose service the tomb owner Erzesinube acts as priest, and as recipient of part of the fine payable by anyone who makes unauthorised use of Erzesinube's tomb. Almost certainly his name is the origin of *Τρῳοβυός* (and its variants), attested as a divine name in the Greek sources.¹⁵ But whether or not he had a Bronze Age pedigree is something we cannot at present determine.

Neumann suggests that the same name occurs in the variant form *Krzzubi* in TL 83. 5, although here it appears not to have been used as the name of a god.

(c) The *Eliyāna* are known only from the trilingual, where they are equated with the Greek *Νύμφαι*. Laroche suggests that they may be Luwian in origin, their name being derived from a possible **aliyana*. If so, the root of the name is apparently the Luwian *ali(ya-)*, which designates a liquid element - lake, pond, or river (Laroche, 1979b, 114). This would indicate that the *Eliyāna* were naiads or water nymphs, and as such were appropriately associated with the water sources of the Letoon (cf. Bichner, 1983, 63).¹⁶ Their cult may have originated in the Bronze Age, but if so it was very likely a purely local cult of western Anatolia, since there is no known reference to it in any of the Hittite sources (cf. Laroche, 1979, 114).

(d) *The Twelve Gods*. The group of Lycian deities known as the

14. Neumann, 1979b, 49-50, citing Laroche, 1966, 93, no. 575.

15. Notably Plutarch, *def. orac.* C 21. For the identification of *Τρῳοβυός* with *Trzzubi*, see Houwink ten Cate, 1965, 104 (with the references cited in n. 1), and Neumann, 1979a, 262.

16. See also Meriggi, 1980, 225, sec. 28.

Twelve Gods are frequently attested in the reliefs and inscriptions of Roman Lycia, as illustrated by the Gömbe plaques dating to the 3rd century A.D.¹⁷ However, there is only one known reference to them in the inscriptions of the epichoric period. This occurs in the Greek epigram in the Xanthos stele inscription, which indicates that the stele was set up in honour of the Twelve Gods (TL 44 c 21-22). The fact that such an important monument was dedicated to these deities might suggest that they occupied a position of some prominence in Lycian religion. But to date we can find no clearly identifiable reference to them in the epichoric texts.¹⁸ It is just possible that they were one and the same as the *māhāi huwedri*, whom we have discussed above (p. 174). But even if this proved to be so, it would not bring us much closer to determining who these deities were, or whether they were in fact distinct from the deities individually named in the inscriptions.

Quite possibly the concept of a group of twelve gods was one which the Lycians inherited from their Bronze Age predecessors. We can compare them with the twelve 'running' gods depicted in relief in the 13th century B.C. rock sanctuary called Yazılıkaya, situated a few kilometres north-east of the Hittite capital Hattusa. There is little doubt that these are Underworld deities, and Gates sees in them the ancestors of the figures appearing in the Gömbe plaques (1974, 166). If so, then the Twelve Gods referred to in the Xanthos stele inscription can perhaps be seen as part of a longstanding Anatolian religious tradition which originates in the Bronze Age, is attested in the mid 1st millennium B.C., and continues until late Roman times. And it may well be that the deities in question were primarily chthonic in function and character.

(e) *Kakasbos*. The "rider god" *Kakasbos* (var. *Kakathibos*) is well attested in the later Greek inscriptions and reliefs of Lycia, which indicate that his cult had a relatively wide distribution in south-west

Asia Minor.¹⁹ He makes no clearly identifiable appearance in the inscriptions of the epichoric period, although *Khakhakba* which occurs in N 314b (line 2) may be the Lycian form of his name, as several scholars have recently proposed.²⁰ Whether or not the equation is valid, it is possible, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, that the god *Kakasbos* is a native Anatolian deity, perhaps of Bronze Age origin (cf. Neumann, 1979a, 266).

Category 3: Deities of Greek origin

(a) *Leto* and (b) *Athene* have been discussed in Category 1 above.

(c) *Aphrodite*. From the vase depicting the judgment of Paris, referred to above, we learn that the Lycian version of Aphrodite's name was *Pedrita*. The name appears also in the variant form *Padrita* in the Xanthos stele inscription where reference is made to an altar of the goddess (*kumeziya Padritahi* - TL 44 b 53),²¹ indicating that her cult had been established in Lycia by the end of the 5th or the beginning of the 4th century.

(d) *Artemis* (Lycian form *Ertemi*) figures in the Xanthos stele inscription in association with *Maliya* and the "Lord of Kaunos". Neumann suggests that the temenos which the three deities apparently shared is to be identified with temple C on the Xanthian acropolis, which has three cellas (1979a, 260, referring to Metzger, 1963, 29-36). The goddess seems to have been a purely Greek addition to the list of Lycian deities, and as far as we know neither replaced nor was identified with an indigenous deity (cf. Laroche, 1980, 5). In addition to her appearance in the stele inscription, she is the subject of two dedicatory inscriptions recently discovered at the Letoon: (a) N 312, a dedication by Demokleides, presumably a Greek living in or visiting Lycia; (b)

17. See, e.g. Bean, 1968, 23, fig. 2, and 24, 1978, 81, 158-59, and note also Weinreich, 1913.

18. Note, however, Laroche, who suggests that a reference to them may occur in TL 44 a 12 which he tentatively restores *ñt[e mah]ānaha:tusñti*. See also Asheri, 1983, 87-91.

19. See Robert, 1946, 38-74, 1949, 50-58 (in particular, 57-58), and Neumann, 1979a, 265-66.

20. Cf. Carruba, 1979, 84, Heubeck, 1979, 80, 1982, 110, Neumann, 1983, 139.

21. See Laroche, 1979b, 115. More recently, however, Laroche has suggested that in this context *Padritahi* may not be the name of the goddess, but rather a theophoric toponym based on her name - a Lycian version of the city-name *Aphrodisias* in Caria (1980, 5).

Erbina II, the part-bilingual inscription which refers to Artemis as the recipient of a bronze statue set up by *Erbina*, some time during the early decades of the 4th century. Her name is also the basis of the theophoric name *Erttimeli* (Greek Ἀρτεμής), the name of the man appointed as *asakhlaza* (ἐπιμελητής) at Xanthos in the administrative arrangements referred to in the trilingual (*N* 320. 5).

It seems clear that the goddess enjoyed a position of some prominence in Lycia by the early 4th century, a position which perhaps reflects increasing Greek cultural influence upon the country at this time.

(e) *Apollo*. Apart from the trilingual, there is no clearly identifiable reference to Apollo in the epichoric inscriptions; and even in the trilingual he is not explicitly named in either the Greek or the Lycian versions.²² The only time his name appears at all in the epichoric texts is as an element in a theophoric name - *Pulenyda* corresponding to Ἀπολλωνίδης in the bilingual *TL* 6 (line 1). But the personal name is obviously Greek to begin with, and certainly cannot be used as evidence for the existence of a cult of the god in Lycia.

We do have a reference to Apollo in the Greek inscription designated above as *Erbina II* (pp. 43-44), but clearly the reference is not to a god resident in Lycia. The inscription indicates *Erbina's* dedication of a statue to Leto, on the advice of the Pythian oracle (line 9) - advice clearly obtained from the oracle of Apollo at Delphi. The very fact that *Erbina* sought his advice so far afield may in itself be an indication that Lycia was not at this time regarded as one of the established haunts of Apollo - as it certainly became in later times.

In our literary sources, however, Apollo is associated with the Lycians as early as the 8th century B.C. In the *Iliad* he is called upon by Zeus to rescue the corpse of the Lycian leader Sarpedon from the battlefield at Troy (*Il.* 16. 667-83) and is credited with restoring to full fighting vigour Sarpedon's second-in-command Glaukos (*Il.* 16.

22. In the Lycian version he is referred to indirectly in the expression *ēni qiahi ebiyehi pñtrēñni se tideime* - 'to the pñtrēñni mother of this sanctuary(?) and (her) children' (lines 38-39). Similarly in the Greek version he is included in the expression Λητοῦς καὶ ἐγγόνων (line 34).

527-32). He seems also to be assigned the role of protecting deity of Pandaros, the "Lycian" leader of another contingent in the battle (see above, pp. 13-14, 35-36), and in this context he is given the epithet Λυκηγενής (*Il.* 4. 101). Yet the meaning of Λυκηγενής is problematical, and although a number of scholars have interpreted it as 'Lycian-born'²³, other interpretations are possible ("wolf-born", 'born-of-light').²⁴ Moreover, Pandaros' role in the *Iliad* raises special problems of its own, as we have already seen. We should also note that in ancient literary sources Delos not Lycia was generally claimed to be the birthplace of Apollo. It was probably not until late Roman times that the tradition of a Lycian birthplace for Apollo gained currency.²⁵ The reason for the association between Apollo and Pandaros in the *Iliad* may simply turn upon the epithet κλυτότοξος applied to Apollo in *Il.* 4. 101. Pandaros' own proficiency with the bow, and the services he is called upon to perform with it make it natural for him to render homage to the divine archer, who had presented him with the bow in the first place (*Il.* 2.827). More generally, it is not unlikely that Apollo's association with the Lycian leaders at Troy is a purely personal one, indicating no more than a kind of temporary divine patronage extended to the foremost of Troy's allies.

The absence of references to Apollo in the epichoric source material suggests that even if the god did have an early association with Lycia he did not come into prominence in the country prior to the Hellenistic period, except perhaps at Patara where the famous oracle was located. Certainly Apollo figures prominently in the foundation legends of Patara, as recorded in the Greco-Roman literary sources - for example, as the father of the eponymous founder Pataros from the nymph Lycia (daughter of Xanthos) (Steph. Byz. s.v. Πάταρα), or alternatively as the father of Lycadius (also from the nymph Lycia), designated in a tradition

23. E.g. Hesychius, s.v. Λυκηγενής; cf. Kretschmer, 1933, 228-29, and 1940, 102, and Tritsch, 1950, 498.

24. "wolf-born" - Aelian, nat. an. 10. 26; cf. Aristotle, hist. an. 6. 29. 2; "born-of-light" - Curtius, G. Et. 5. 160. See also the references in Kruse, 1927, 2269, s.v. Lykeios.

25. Cf. Quintus Smyrnaeus, 11. 19-26, Schol. ad *Il.* 4. 101.

recorded by Servius as the founder of the city (*Verg. Aen.* 3. 332).²⁶ I have referred also in Chapter 2 to the tradition recorded by Diodoros which recounts the Telchines' migration to Lycia and their founding of a temple of Apollo on the banks of the Xanthos river, which very likely is a reference to Apollo's temple at Patara (p. 39). And we could add to the list of Apolline associations with Patara the alleged derivation of the city's name from *patara*, a box of sacrificial cakes intended as offerings for Apollo; the box was carried by sea to the Lycian shore to the site where a sacrifice was made to Apollo, the site where the city was subsequently built.²⁷

Yet all the sources which link Apollo with Patara are late, and we should note that although the oracle is attested in Greek literature at least as early as the 5th century B.C., we have no evidence that it was associated with Apollo at this time. In Herodotos (1. 182), our earliest source of information on the oracle, there is no explicit connection between Apollo and the oracle. In fact, the god associated with the oracle is left unnamed.

Scholars have recently sought to identify Apollo with an alleged native deity called Natri, discussed below in Category 5. But even if such a deity did exist, he can have played no more than a very minor role in Lycian religion, and it would be surprising to find Apollo equated with a local deity of such insignificance.

The establishment of a cult of Apollo in Lycia may have gone hand in hand with, or followed in the wake of, the transformation of the Lycian mother goddess into Leto. And the concept of a divine triad, in which Leto is closely associated with Apollo and Artemis, seems also to

26. In another version, he is the son of Lapeon and brother of Xanthos (Eustathius ad Dionys. *Perieg.* 5. 129).

27. Alexander Polyhistor, ap. Steph. Byz. s.v. Πάταρα. The name Patara may in fact have been derived from a word meaning basket or receptacle of some kind, but a word which was Anatolian not Greek in origin, and probably associated with the Hittite substantive *pattar* (see Neumann, 1961, 56-57). Bean is not aware of this possibility when he comments that "the word *patara* is not Greek nor yet Lycian, but is apparently the same as the Latin *patera*, a plain indication that the tale is a comparatively late invention" (1978, 82).

have been an innovation in Lycia, introduced under Greek influence. Prior to the 4th century, there is no indication of the triad in Lycia, either in epichoric or in Greek sources.

The first explicit association of all three Letoids occurs in the trilingual, in which Leto in association with her children and the nymphs is called upon to punish anyone interfering with the regulations set out on the stele. As we noted above, Apollo and Artemis are not explicitly named in either the Lycian or the Greek versions of the inscription, but the Aramaic version names Artemis and refers to Apollo under the guise of the name Hšatrapati, an appellation used of Mithras, the Persian equivalent of Apollo (see Dupont-Sommer, 1979, 155-56).

Under Greek influence, the cult of the Letoids gained progressively in importance through the Hellenistic period, as indicated by the substantial archaeological remains of this and the Roman imperial period at the Letoon, and also by the designation of the divine triad as the *πατέρες θεοί*, the national gods of Lycia.²⁸ It was essentially a Hellenic triad and probably marked a significant divergence from the religious traditions current in the period of the epichoric inscriptions.

(f) *Zeus*. I have noted above the suggestion that Zeus Solymeus, attested in the later Greek inscriptions of eastern Lycia and Pisidia, may have been the old Anatolian god Tarhunt/Trqqas in another guise. However we also have a reference to Zeus in the epichoric period, namely in the Greek epigram from the Xanthos stele inscription where the god is named (in the form Ζήν) as the recipient of the trophies won by the author of the inscription in battle (line 30). This suggests that Zeus already had a position of some prominence in Lycian religion by the end of the 5th century - or rather that by this time he had already been equated with Trqqas (who certainly does figure prominently in the inscription²⁹) and is referred to in the epigram as the closest Greek equivalent to the native deity.

28. See, e.g. TAM II 496, and also the reference to the sanctuary of the Letoids in an inscription on a stele from Telmessos (c. 279 B.C.) appearing in Wörle, 1978, 202 (lines 43-45).

29. TL 44 b 34, c 34, c 64, d 12, d 14, d 44.

Category 4: Deities of Carian origin

(a) *Khñtawata Khbidēñni* = βασιλεὺς Καύνιος - the "Lord of Kaunos", one of the two deities in whose honour the cult referred to in the trilingual is to be established. Very likely we have further references to this deity in two Hellenistic decrees from the Carian city of Kaunos which make mention of a βασιλεὺς ὁ θεός and in a dedicatory inscription from the island of Kos in which the words βασιλέως Καυνίου occur.³⁰

The deity is also referred to in the Xanthos stele inscription:

*se khbide sttati mē:sttala:ēti:qlahibiyehi:se mal[i]yahi:
se [m]ertemehi:se khñtawatehi:khbidēñhi (TL 44 c 6-9)*

and Kaunos will erect a stele in honour of (?) (the temenos?) of this sanctuary, and of Maliya, and of Artemis, and of the Lord of Kaunos (TL 44 c 6-9).

It is clear from this passage that the Lord of Kaunos was already established in Xanthos by the end of the 5th century,³¹ and the trilingual may well indicate a revival of his cult in Lycia in the 4th century,³² along with a strengthening of cultural and political ties between Caria and Lycia.

(b) *Arkazuma* = Ἀρκεσίμας. The Lord of Kaunos is coupled with the deity *Arkazuma*/Arkesimas in the trilingual. We have no other

30. The decrees were published by Bean, 1954, 95, no. 37b, 6, and 98, no. 38c. 16. The dedicatory inscription appears in Paton and Hicks, 1891, 109, no. 53. See Bean's discussion, 1954, 96 and Metzger, 1974, 89 and 1979, 38. Bean suggests that in these three inscriptions, we have 'evidence of a cult of the legendary eponymous founder and king Caunos, the son of Miletus (Aristocritus FGH IIIB, no. 493, I = FGH IV 334, 2).

31. Neumann suggests, on the basis of his proposed identification of the temenos of Maliya, Artemis, and the Lord of Kaunos with temple C on the acropolis at Xanthos, that the cult of the Carian deity may have gone back as early as the 6th century in Xanthos (1979a, 260). But note the doubts expressed by Frei as to the precise location of the deity's sanctuary (1981, 369).

32. Cf. Heubeck, 1979, 251-52. Heubeck comments: "Es ist zu vermuten, dass dieser Gott in seinem Herkunftsort sowohl einen karischen Namen sowie ausserdem die (ebenfalls karische) Bezeichnung 'Herrscher von Kaunos' besessen hat die dann von Lykiern und Griechen je die äquivalente Übersetzung in ihre Sprachen erfahren hat."

information about this deity, and at this stage it is impossible to say whether his/her association with the Kaunian god is of any particular significance.³³

Category 5: Other possible Lycian deities

(a) *Natri*. The suggestion that there was a Lycian god called *Natri* arises out of the equation between the names *Natrbbiyēmi* and *Apolloedotos* in the trilingual (line 4 Lycian version, lines 3-4 Greek version). Since *-bbiyēmi* (= *-piyēmi*) seems to be a past participle form of the Lycian verb *piye-* "give", corresponding to the Greek *-dotos*, *Natr-*, the first element of the compound name, may be the Lycian equivalent of *Apollo*, or a Lycian epithet of *Apollo*.³⁴ We do in fact have two occurrences of *natri*, both in the Xanthos stele inscription (TL 44 c 33 and 48), but in contexts which are quite obscure. Indeed in the second case the reading *natri* is not altogether certain since *na* and *tri* are separated by a word divider (*na:tri*) - although such "irrational division" is not unknown in the epicchoric texts.³⁵

Gusmani and Neumann find support for the identification of *Natri* as the Lycian counterpart of *Apollo* in the appearance of *turakhssali* immediately before *na:tri* in TL 44 c 48. They construe *turakhssali* as an epithet of *natri* equating it with *ὑπερεός* which according to Pausanias (2.21.13) was the epithet attached to *Apollo* in the oracular shrine at *Kyaneae*. This leads Neumann to suggest that *Turakhssi* may be the indigenous Lycian name for *Kyaneae*.³⁶

33. Laroche suggests that he was an acolyte of the Lord of Kaunos, and probably also Caunian in origin (1979b, 114). According to Heubeck his name is of Greek origin (1979, 252 with n. 16). On the form of the name in Lycian, see Meriggi, 1980, 221-22, sec. 18.

34. See Tritsch, 1976, 165-66, Gusmani, 1977, 53, Laroche, 1979b, 61-62, Neumann, 1979a, 263, Meriggi, 1980, 222. Laroche suggests that (a)natr(a) may be connected with the Greek ἀνάκτωρ, a rare variant of ἄναξ which is one of the titles associated with *Apollo*. But note Frei's comments, 1981, 360.

35. Note, e.g., *t:uhe* (TL 48a, 3), *pdēneh:ñmi* (TL 106. 1).

36. See Neumann, 1979a, 263, with n.15. The word *turakhssi* occurs earlier in the inscription in a context which apparently deals with the revolt of *Amorges* (a 53). Arkwright long ago suggested that the word might be the origin of the Greek epithet *ὑπερεός* (cited by Meriggi,

The whole line of argument which seeks to establish Natri as a Lycian god is plausible, although it is no more than a series of conjectures built one upon the other. And, as we noted above, if such a god did exist, his role in Lycian religion seems to have been a very minor one.

(b) *Hppñterus* occurs twice in the epichoric inscriptions, on both occasions immediately preceding *māhāi* ("god/gods"): TL 58. 5 - *hppñterus māhāi miñtehi*, and TL 139. 4 - *h[p]pñte[rus] māhāi*. On the basis of the first of these phrases, Laroche has suggested that *hppñterus* was the name of a god - the god of the *miñti* ("dieu de la mindis") (1967, 54). This interpretation is, in my view, unlikely. I have argued elsewhere that *hppñterus* is not the name of a god, but rather an epithet qualifying *māhāi*, and that *hppñterus māhāi* may parallel (but is not necessarily equivalent to) expressions like θεοὶ (κατα)χθόνιαι in the Greek inscriptions (Bryce, 1981a, 85).

As Heubeck points out, however, it would be remarkable to find in Lycian an adjective preceding the noun it qualifies (1982, 111-12; cf. Laroche, 1974, 129). For this reason he prefers to take up the suggestion made by Meriggi and subsequently Carruba that *māhāi* is to be construed here as a gen. plur. dependent on *hppñterus*. Meriggi translates *hppñterus māhāi* as "il rappresentante degli Dei" (the representative of the god) (1979, 266), Carruba as "Opfergemeinschaft der Götter", "Tempel der Götter" ("Sacrificial guild of the gods, temple of the gods") (1970, 37, 1978, 169). Heubeck favours the third of these proposals, suggesting a parallel with *ēni qlahi ebiyehi* ("the mother of this sanctuary") or *qla ebi* ("the sanctuary here"); as we have seen, both of these expressions figure in the sepulchral inscriptions as the subjects of penalty clauses.

(c) - (i) I include below further possible additions to the list of Lycian deities, as suggested by Neumann and based for the most part either on considerations of context or on the analysis of supposed theophoric names. Of course in the latter case even when Lycian personal names

1936, 280), although there is nothing of an explicit nature in the earlier passage which suggests a possible connection with Apollo or Kyaneae.

can be classified as theophoric, we cannot automatically assume that the divine elements which they contain are the names of Lycian deities. If in fact the divine element is of foreign or pre-Lycian origin, then it may well refer to a deity who was not worshipped in Lycia.

The list that follows, then, is a very speculative one, and I shall confine myself merely to indicating the various identifications proposed by Neumann and referring the reader to his discussion of them.

Identifications based on contextual considerations:

- (c) *Eheti* (TL 44 b 48) - Neumann, 1979a, 261.
- (d) *Ddewezi* (TL 65. 24) - Neumann, 1979a, 260-61.
- (e) *(E)heledi* (N306. 4, 309c. 4-5) - Neumann, 1979a, 262, 1979b, 25.
- (f) *Khba* (TL 44 a 44, 102. 4, 106. 2, N 309c. 6) (= Late Bronze Age Hepat?)³⁷ - Neumann, 1974, 1979a, 262, 1979b, 25.
- (g) *Tesūmi* (N 309c. 7) (= Hattic Tasimmet(i)?) - Neumann, 1979a, 262, 1979b, 25.³⁸

Identifications based on supposed theophoric names:

- (h) *Rūma-* (as in *Erūmenēni* in TL 121. 1) (= Late Bronze Age Arma, the moon god?) - Neumann, 1979a, 263-65.
- (i) *Ia-* (as in *Iyamara* in TL 149. 2) (= Mesopotamian Ea?) - Neumann, 1979a, 265.

Kronos

I have referred in Chapter 2 (p. 20) to the tradition in Plutarch which records that Kronos was a deity originally worshipped by the Solymians, who abandoned his cult after he killed their three *archegetes*. The appearance of Kronos in a tradition relating to

37. Against this view see Laroche, 1979b, 115, n. 11.

38. (e), (f), and (g) appear together in N 309c. 4-7 in what Neumann regards as a list of deities: *latāi:seheledi:se:trbbāmara: se:pddēkhba.....se tesūmi*. He suggests however that *trbbāmara* is a personified abstraction 'Anordnung gegen etwas = Verbot' (1979a, 262, 1979b, 25), and, as noted above, he accepts Gusmani's proposal that *latāi*, the first name on the list, is the Lycian name for Leto.

south-west Asia Minor is without precedent in the literary sources, and this led the 19th century scholar Lobeck to suggest that the name should be amended to Kragos (cited by Treuber, 1886, 31). Yet Lobeck's suggestion was long ago rejected (implicitly by Treuber, *ibid.*), and more recently Robert argued that the passage in Plutarch does in fact indicate, albeit in a very slight and obscure way, the establishment of a cult of Kronos in Lycia (1949, 53). Robert notes that such a cult is reflected in several inscriptions of the Roman imperial period which indicate that Kronos was held in special honour at Tlos at that time, and was perhaps the city's most important deity (1949, 52-53).³⁹ He stresses that the cult could not have come to Lycia from the Greek world, since no cult of Kronos was known there; rather it was of a different foreign origin, or else developed out of the cult of an indigenous Anatolian deity, who later appeared under the name Kronos (1978, 43-44; cf. Robert in RBG 79, 1966, 746, n. 6).

Whatever the origin of the cult, I believe that the passage in Plutarch must be regarded as very dubious evidence for its early establishment in Lycia. Certainly we have no known indications of such a cult in the epichoric texts. Nor in fact does Plutarch's account suggest that the cult of Kronos was adopted in Lycia after its abandonment by the Solymians. Indeed it is Kronos' victims, the three *archegetes*, who are deified and honoured in Lycia.⁴⁰ For these reasons, I believe that we can do no more with Kronos at present beyond noting (a) Plutarch's statement that the Solymians had a cult in his honour which they

39. The inscriptions cited by Robert are TAM II 585, 554, and 581. In the latter two cases, the reading of the name depends on textual restorations. The first of the inscriptions, TAM II 585, is the most significant, indicating the celebration of great festivals in Kronos' honour. All three inscriptions are late, TAM II 585 dating to the 3rd century A.D., and 554 and 581 probably to the 2nd century A.D.

40. Plutarch's account also raises the question of why the Lycians decided to honour the three victims of Kronos if in fact they were Solymian. Robert suggests that the *archegetes* killed by Kronos were those of the Lycians, and that the deed took place during the course of some combat between Solymians and Lycians (1949, 53-54). If this is so, it is difficult to see why the Lycians should then establish a cult in honour of Kronos.

subsequently abandoned; (b) the three inscriptions which indicate the existence of his cult at Tlos in the Roman imperial period; (c) the suggestion that the tradition which Plutarch records may reflect, in a very indirect way, the initial establishment of the cult of Kronos, or the deity with whom he came to be identified, in Lycia.

The cult of the Lord of Kaunos and Arkazuma

Prior to the discovery of the trilingual, the epichoric inscriptions of Lycia had provided us with very little useful information about Lycian cult practices. In view of this fact alone the importance of the trilingual inscription, which gives detailed instructions for the establishment of a new cult at Xanthos, can scarcely be overestimated. The cult is to be set up in honour of two deities, designated as the Lord of Kaunos and Arkazuma, and the inscription provides for the appointment of a priest to the cult, regulations for the cult's maintenance, and threats of divine retribution for violation of these regulations. This information is provided at length in the Lycian and Greek versions of the text, while the Aramaic version is expressed in a terser, more concise form and is to be understood as the official sanction for the cult given by the Carian satrap Pixodaros. For the Lycian text, along with a translation, see above, pp. 91-93.

We note that responsibility for the establishment and maintenance of the cult rests with the local population of the district of Xanthos. The various provisions made for the cult include the appointment of a priest, (E)seimiya (Greek Simias) (*lines 9-10*), whose chief responsibility was probably to make sacrifice to the deities on behalf of the whole community. It would appear from the Greek version of the inscription that the office was to be an hereditary one, to be held in perpetuity by members of Simias' family line. Whether or not the position was a salaried one is unclear. But at all events its incumbent was apparently entitled to exemption from property dues (*line 12*).

In connection with the cult, a certain area of land was to be set aside - land worked by Khesñtēdi and Pigrēi (*line 15*), and probably situated somewhere in the low-lying plain outside the city of Xanthos. Its purpose seems to have been essentially to provide revenue from its produce to meet expenses connected with the cult. Another source of

revenue was a yearly tribute equivalent to 1 1/2 Greek *minas* from the city of Xanthos along with a small payment to be made by newly enfranchised citizens, probably one shekel or two Greek drachmas apiece (lines 18-22). The revenue coming from these payments must have been an almost insignificantly small amount - perhaps little more than a token gesture to formalise the responsibility undertaken by the Xanthians in connection with the cult. In all probability the cult involved no great monetary outlay, the major item of expense perhaps being the recurring sacrifices referred to in lines 25-30. These sacrificial rites, involving monthly and yearly animal sacrifices, may have been similar to the rites which seem occasionally to have been carried out in honour of the dead, as I have discussed above (pp. 126-27).

Lines 30-34 refer to the oaths taken by the Xanthians to uphold the regulations inscribed on the stele. Then follows a statement which prohibits any alteration or erasure of the regulations appearing thereon. This type of prohibition reflects a long-standing Anatolian practice of investing formal documents with a sacrosanct character. For instance, the Hittite treaties which were drawn up by various Hittite kings with their vassal rulers were ratified by the gods of the Hittite homeland as well as by those of the vassal state. Consequently violation of the terms of the treaty rendered the violator liable to punishment by the deities who had been invoked. In the case of the trilingual, any person found guilty of erasing/altering any of the regulations on the stele would be liable to the wrath both of the deities to whom the cult was dedicated as well as to Leto, her children, and the nymphs. We have already noted that Leto, or her Lycian counterpart, figures in the sepulchral inscriptions as a punitive agent called upon to protect a tomb against violation of the owner's instructions. Here again she appears in a disciplinary role, but this time in association with her children.

The information contained in the trilingual makes it incontestably the most important inscription, apart from the Xanthos stele inscription, so far discovered from the epichoric period of Lycian history.⁴¹

41. See also Asheri's discussion of the information provided by the trilingual on the society and institutions of Xanthos, 1983, 107-23.

Without doubt it sheds valuable light on cult practice in Lycia during this period, especially with regard to practical matters involved in the administration of a cult in honour of a particular deity or deities. Admittedly the cult of the Lord of Kaunos and Arkazuma may have been part of the 'new deal' imposed on Lycia in the wake of the satrap rebellion, and it is possible that it contained certain features which were without precedent in Lycian religious practice. Yet it is unlikely that the cult marked too radical a departure from the standard practices of Lycian religion. And indeed from the Persian point of view it would have been politically desirable to avoid offending Lycian sensitivities, especially in the area of religion. We are probably safe in assuming, then, that the arrangements and regulations contained in the trilingual reflect religious practice in general in Lycia, at least up to the Hellenistic period, and that similar provisions already operated with existing Lycian cults in honour of the various Lycian deities. If this is a valid assumption, then the trilingual is clearly a most important source of information on Lycian religion during the period of the epichoric language.

The Lycian oracles

In our brief examination of Lycian religion, we have noted the various local deities of the country and their Bronze Age pedigrees, the local cults associated with them, their role as protectors of tombs, and various practical matters associated with their cult. Our Greco-Roman literary sources provide information about another aspect of Lycian religious practice which seems to have been widespread in the country, and for which the country was quite famous; yet as far as we can at present determine, the epichoric inscriptions contain no evidence of this practice - namely, the practice of divination. To what extent was divination an indigenous feature of the Lycian civilisation, and to what extent did it develop under Greek influence?

The earliest attested reference to the practice in Lycia occurs in Herodotos (1. 182), who refers to the temple at Patara where a priestess 'of the god' (unnamed) enclosed herself during the night in order to

gain prophetic inspiration.⁴² The common assumption is that the god in question was Apollo, for Patara came to be regarded as one of the most important oracular seats of the god, rivalling that of Delphi (see Pomponius Mela 1. 15. 82).

Yet all the sources which provide this information are late, and I have suggested above that an actual cult of Apollo may not have been established in Lycia before the end of the 5th or the beginning of the 4th century B.C.⁴³ We should recall that in Herodotos' reference to the oracle at Patara no mention is made of Apollo. In just the same way as Leto seems to have absorbed or taken over the cult of an indigenous mother goddess in Lycia in the 4th century, Apollo may likewise have taken over the oracular seat at Patara from an indigenous deity during the 4th century, and this may have been the starting point of the traditions associating Apollo with the site.⁴⁴

42. Farnell observes a certain resemblance between this practice and the prophetic ritual at Argos (1907, 122 and 229).

43. There may well have been a literary assumption of a link between Apollo and Lycia before this, to judge from the implicit association between Apollo, Artemis, and Lycia in Sophocles, *Oed.* 203-08, and Apollo and Lycia in Bacchylides, 12. 147-48, referring to Apollo Loxias as ΛΟΧΙΑΝ ἄναξ. But the assumed link was almost certainly based on the spurious etymology which gives the name Lycia a Greek derivation, cognate with the epithet commonly applied to Apollo - ΛΥΜΕΛΟΣ as in Sophocles, *Oed.* 203 - and has little weight as evidence for the existence of a cult of Apollo in the country prior to the end of the 5th century B.C. It is of course possible that the eventual establishment of the Apolline cult in Lycia was facilitated by the false etymology which may well have paved the way for the absorption of an indigenous deity by a Greek newcomer. We might perhaps note here the reference in the play *Rhesus* to a temple of Apollo in Lycia (line 224). However although the play is commonly assigned to Euripides, its authorship and date are much in doubt; it may in fact have been written in the 4th century - and for this reason cannot be used in support of an earlier date for the establishment of a cult of Apollo in Lycia.

44. Bean, however, would argue for a much earlier association, claiming that it was Apollo's oracle at Patara that advised the Trojan hero Telephos, wounded by Achilles, that the wound could only be healed by the wounder - which was eventually accomplished by rust from Achilles' spear. The

Up to this time the Pataran oracle may have been purely a local one of no great prominence. It is worth noting that no mention of it is made by Herodotos amongst the oracles consulted by Kroisos, a significant omission given that Kroisos seems to have sent to all the most important oracular seats in Greece, Asia Minor, and Libya for responses to his question concerning Persia (see *Herodotos* 1. 46).

However, from the 4th century onwards, the Pataran oracle gained in importance, an importance which seems to have peaked in the 1st century B.C. when it clearly enjoyed a status equivalent to that of Delphi and Delos. This is made clear by the Augustan writers. Horace (*carm.* 3. 4. 61-64), for example, refers to Apollo as "he....who haunts the thickets of Lycia and his native forest, Apollo of Delos and of Patara." And Vergil makes several references to the Pataran oracle in Book 4 of the *Aeneid* (4. 143, 346, 377). In the first of these references, Vergil indicates that Apollo divides his time between Patara and Delos, spending the winter months in Patara and the summer in Delos - a reasonable division in view of the mildness of the Lycian winters, as Servius notes (*Verg. Aen.* 4. 143),⁴⁵ and the severity of the Lycian summers.⁴⁶ This enabled the god to maintain two chief places of residence, and also accords to some extent with the earlier tradition recorded by Herodotos that the oracular seat at Patara was not occupied for the whole of the year.

The importance of the Pataran oracle is made clear in Aeneas' claim that it was the *Lyciae sortes* that bade him seek out Italy, thus attributing to the oracle an extremely significant role in the founding of the Roman civilisation (*Vergil, Aen.* 4. 345-46). We might note,

grounds for this claim are several associations between Telephos and Apollo's oracle at Patara recorded in the literary sources, discussed by Bean (1978, 82-83). I would simply make the point that none of these sources can be traced back before the 4th century B.C. (*Menaechmus*, cited by Steph. Byz. on Telephos, wrote in the mid-4th century) and cannot be used as evidence of an association between Apollo and Patara prior to the 4th century.

45. *hibernam Lyciam non asperam, sed aptam hiemare cupientibus, sic enim se habet natura regionis* (cf. Treuber, 1887, 85).

46. Regularly 90° F (= c. 32.5° C), according to Bean (1978, 19).

incidentally, that if we can interpret *sortes* literally, then the use of the word here suggests that the oracular utterances were given on tablets.

In the 1st century A.D., however, the oracle apparently declined in importance, to judge from a statement by Pomponius Mela (*chor.* 1. 15. 82) who refers to the oracle as having *formerly* rivalled Delphi, although it is still listed by Statius in the *Thebaid* (8. 200) among Apollo's cult places which include Tenedos, Chrysa, Delos, Claros, Miletos, and Didyma. If such a decline did occur, there may have been a revival in the 2nd century A.D., according to Bean who refers to an inscription recording Opramoas' benefactions under Antoninus Pius. These included a gift of 20,000 denarii to the Pataran oracle of Apollo, which had begun to give prophecy again after a long period of silence.⁴⁷

By the 4th century A.D. the oracle had apparently become defunct, if such can be inferred from Servius' commentary on the *Aeneid* (4. 377) where Servius speaks of the oracle in the past tense (*lines* 34-36 of his commentary). Bean explains this by noting that Servius was writing soon after the famous edict of Theodosius in 385 A.D. which put an end to all oracles (Bean, 1978, 84; cf. Bean, 1979, 238).

The high prominence of the oracle in Roman times was probably due in no small measure to Patara's prominence in general in this period when it had assumed the status of one of Lycia's largest and most important cities, an importance due to its harbour facilities and its commercially and militarily strategic position on the south coast of Asia Minor. The location of the oracle in one of Lycia's chief cities, and above all its accessibility to travellers and merchants from all parts of the Mediterranean and Near Eastern world were in themselves factors which must have promoted the oracle's importance and ensured its status as a leading oracular centre.

To the east of the Xanthos valley oracular seats of Apollo are attested at Sura, Myra, and Kyaneae. In these "provincial" centres, the

47. Bean, 1978, 84, quoting from TAM II 905 XVII E 10-13. Note also the reference to the oracle in Lucian, *bis accus.* 1. Treuber suggests that from the mid-2nd century A.D. onwards, it was, like many other oracles, galvanised as a weapon against Christianity (1887, 83-84).

most common form of divination was the interpretation of the behaviour of fish. According to Plutarch (*sol. an.* 976C), the procedure was very similar to augury. The diviners would observe the movements of fish, their twists and turns, their movements towards or away from each other, and interpret these movements in accordance with fixed rules, or commonsense. A different explanation, however, is offered by Aelian. Aelian (*nat. an.* 12. 1) claims that a sacrifice of calves is made to the god and the flesh is then thrown to the fish in the bay of Myra where the oracle of the god is situated. If the fish eat the flesh the omens are good, but if they discard it and cast it upon the shore with their tails, this signifies that the god is angry.

A similar procedure is reported by Pliny (*nat.* 31. 18. 22) at Limyra where the river often crosses into neighbouring districts, in itself indicative of some portent,⁴⁸ and also at Myra where the fish in the spring of Apollo called Curius are summoned three times by a pipe (Pliny, *nat.* 32. 8. 17). Polycharmus, however, states that the priest of Apollo practised divination by observing not the behaviour but the species of fish that appeared. In his account (*ap. Athenaeus, deip.* 8. 333D-E), the enquirer approached the pool holding two wooden spits, on each of which was ten pieces of roast meat. The meat was thrown into the pool, which then filled with sea water, and a great number of fish came forth, some of very large size. The priest identified the species of fish, and used this as the basis for his response to the enquirer. Artemidoros' reference to the oracle (*ap. Athenaeus, deip.* 8. 333F) seems to be on similar lines, though Artemidoros states that the spring of water which appears is fresh, and that the offerings are thrown into the pool after the fish have appeared, and include cakes or bread as well as flesh.

Tangible remains of the oracular seat at Sura are still to be seen. Most notable is the small temple near the marshy inlet which was once the harbour at Sura. Bean refers to a number of inscriptions carved on the interior walls of the temple recording devotions paid by the

48. An oracle at Limyra is also attested by coins of the Roman imperial period which bear the legend *Λιμυρεῶν χρησμός* (von Aucock, 1974, nos. 109-13).

suppliants, although the offerings are not to Apollo but to the god Sozon (Bean, 1978, 131), apparently a local Anatolian deity in origin whose cult is attested in Greek inscriptions of the Hellenistic period in various parts of south-west Asia Minor (see Weinreich, 1927). In some of these inscriptions, Sozon's name is simply attached as an epithet to that of Apollo (or in some cases Zeus), which seems to indicate that his cult may have been largely superseded or absorbed by the cult of the Greek god. And perhaps at Sura, where his name survives without any reference to Apollo, he may have been thought of essentially as a regional version of the Greek god in the cult centre there.

The references to the spring or whirlpool in which the fish appeared at Sura seem to be borne out by the natural phenomena still evident on the site. Bean comments as follows: "Just in front of the temple a number of springs well up in the stream - that is, the sea in antiquity - giving a swirling effect to the surface of the water; this agrees exactly with the local inhabitants' account of the 'whirlpool', and explains the curious expression 'a well of sea-water'. Even the mysterious filling of the pool could be managed easily enough by the priest by means of some apparatus to control the fountain of Apollo." (1978, 132).

A different method of divination was attested for the oracular shrine of Apollo Thyrsos at Kyaneae. Here the procedure was for the enquirer to gaze into the sacred pool, to see there "everything he wants to behold", as recorded by Pausanias (7. 21. 13).

It may be that several of the oracular seats associated with Apollo in Lycia were established initially under Greek influence and date back no earlier than the 4th century B.C. However we certainly cannot discount the possibility that the practice of divination in Lycia arose first within a native Anatolian context. Divination and omen-taking figure prominently in our Hittite religious texts, and some elements of these practices may well have filtered down into the 1st millennium civilisations of Anatolia. In Lycia, the Pataran oracle in particular may have been an indigenous foundation in origin, which only later came to be associated with a Hellenic deity. We have noted above Herodotus' statement that the priestess of the god enclosed herself within the temple at night in order to gain prophetic inspiration. If this can be

taken to mean that oracular wisdom came to the priestess while she slept, in the form of dreams, it reminds us quite closely of Hittite religious experience in which dreams were a fundamental means of communication between deities and human beings (see Archi, 1971, 190). But whether in this respect there was a connection, direct or indirect, between Lycian and Hittite religious practice is something which at present we are unable to claim with any degree of confidence.

The apparent absence of references to oracles or to divination in our epichoric sources may seem somewhat at odds with the notion that divination was a longstanding element of Lycian religious practice. But we should remember that the surviving epichoric inscriptions are for the most part not of the kind likely to contain references to oracular practices; or alternatively there may be references to such practices in passages which have so far defied translation - notably in the Xanthos stele inscription.

But even if the oracular practices attested in the Greco-Roman sources did arise from native origins, they had doubtless undergone substantial modification along Hellenic lines by the time they received literary mention. It may be that the Pataran oracle, probably one of the earliest oracular foundations in the country, inspired the development of other oracular seats during the process of Hellenisation of Lycia. The situation then may have been that of a country with a longstanding if limited oracular tradition upon which were grafted Greek oracular procedures leading to the development and branching out of oracular seats on essentially Hellenic lines.

In addition to the oracular seats referred to above, divination is frequently mentioned in the literary sources in association with Telmessos. But there was a Carian Telmessos (near Halikarnassos) as well as the Telmessos which was eventually incorporated into Lycian territory, and both seem to have had oracular seats of the god Apollo. Unfortunately the literary sources seldom make it clear which city is being referred to when Telmessian oracular practices are being described, or when advice is sought from Telmessian seers. Very likely the Greco-Roman writers were themselves often unclear as to which of the two cities specific oracular responses, or responses arising from divination, ought to be attributed, or else were unaware that divination

was practised in two cities with identical names.

In all probability divination proceeded along similar lines in both places, which may well have had close links with each other. I have referred in chapter 2 to the possibility that the Termilae, one of the basic elements of the Lycian population, had originally settled in Caria, as indicated by the Carian place names Telmessos, Termeros etc., whence they subsequently drifted eastwards into Lycia. It is quite conceivable that Lycian Telmessos was founded by a group of settlers from Carian Telmessos who retained a number of their original traditions and customs along with the name of their earlier settlement. This may well account for the establishment of the practice of divination in Lycian Telmessos and explain how it came about that the practice was associated with two places of the same name.

If this explanation is valid, then the practices and procedures of divination as attested in the literary sources may, in some instances at least, be applicable to both places, even though we are often unable to make specific attributions in the cases that are recorded. Divination was in the hands of a priestly caste, the prophetic gift being regarded as an inherited one, and possessed by women and children as well as by men. As Arrian reports (*anab.* 2. 3. 3), the particular skill of the Telmessian priests lay in the interpretation of prodigies, as illustrated by Arrian's account of the Phrygian Gordius' journey to Telmessos to seek from the seers an interpretation of the omen of an eagle settling on the yoke of his oxen as he ploughed (*anab.* 2. 3. 3-4). It was this journey which, incidentally, led to the origin of the Gordian knot.

The story suggests a tradition of considerable antiquity for the oracular practices associated with the name Telmessos, and they were certainly widely known by the 6th century B.C. when the Telmessian seers were consulted by two of the Lydian monarchs, as recorded by Herodotos (1.84). The first of these was Meles, predecessor of Kroisos, who was advised on consulting the seers of Telmessos to have the lion (which allegedly was born to him by his concubine) carried around the walls of Sardis to ensure that the city would be invulnerable to enemy attack. Meles followed the seers' advice, except for one part of the citadel which was so precipitous that it was regarded as impossible to mount a successful attack on it. This proved to be the weak point

in the city's defences, which were breached by the enemy forces, and Sardis was captured and sacked.

Herodotos (1.78) also reports that Kroisos consulted the Telmessian seers, seeking an explanation for the fact that prior to Cyrus' advance on Sardis snakes swarmed in the outer part of the city and were devoured by the horses in preference to their pasturage. The seers interpreted this omen as a warning to Kroisos that he must expect a foreign army to attack his country and subdue its inhabitants, for the snake was the child of the earth and the horse was a foe and a foreigner. Herodotos further reports that before Kroisos' messengers reached Sardis on the return sea voyage with the explanation provided by the Telmessian seers, Kroisos had been taken prisoner. The reference to a sea voyage in this context suggests that the Telmessos in question in this instance was the Lycian Telmessos which lay on the coast rather than the Carian Telmessos which lay inland in the mountains.⁴⁹

The reputation of the Telmessian seers persisted through Hellenistic and Roman times. For example, Alexander the Great consulted a Telmessian seer Aristander while he was laying siege to Halikarnassos and subsequently took Aristander with him on his expedition to the Indus river (*Arrian, anab.* 1, 25. 8, 4. 3. 7, 4. 4. 3).⁵⁰ And in Roman times Cicero (*divin.* 1. 94)⁵¹ refers to the Telmessians as *in ostentis animadvertendis diligentes*, and the Elder Pliny (*nat.* 30. 2. 6) describes the city as *urbs religiosissima*.

While in Hellenistic and Roman times the Telmessian oracle, whether Lycian or Carian, seems never to have achieved the prominence of the Pataran oracle, it may well in earlier times have influenced the procedures and practices associated with the latter, especially if, as

49. Cf. Ruge, 1934, 414, who also points out that the greater distance between Sardis and Lycian Telmessos fits in better with this episode (than would the shorter distance between Sardis and Carian Telmessos).

50. Bean prefers to assign Aristander to Carian Telmessos on the grounds of the proximity of the latter (c. 12 kms.) to Halikarnassos which Alexander was besieging at the time of the prodigy which he experienced and which led him to consult Aristander (1978, 40).

51. See also Cicero, *div.* 1. 25 and 1. 41 where reference is made to the Lycii augures.

seems likely, its oracular traditions were older than those of Patara. The Telmessian seers were concerned essentially with the interpretation of omens and dreams experienced by their consultants, and it may well be that the priestess or the seers at Patara performed much the same function. If this is so, then the oracular traditions of Patara and Telmessos might justly be regarded as an integral, longstanding element of the indigenous civilisation of south-west Asia Minor rather than an intrusive foreign element introduced into an area that had no oracular traditions of its own. Even if the oracular procedures of Lycia did for the most part have a distinctly Greco-Roman character, this need not indicate that they were Greek or Roman in origin. They may well have been indigenous foundations whose procedures were transformed, originally under Greek influence, to bring them in line with practices associated with oracular seats elsewhere in the Greek world.

7. LYCIA - THE GRECO-ROMAN VIEW

In spite of the variety of our literary and epigraphic sources of information on ancient Lycia, there are still many gaps in our knowledge of the Lycian people. While we can draw a number of broad, often tentative conclusions about their political structures, their family units, their religious practices, their material achievements, their ethnic origins, and their cultural affinities, the information we have is very selective and very incomplete - and would continue to be so even if their language was more intelligible to us.¹ The surviving epigraphic material was intended to serve very limited purposes, and is far from comprehensive in the light it throws on Lycian society and lifestyles at large. And the susceptibility of the Lycian civilisation to foreign influences, especially towards the end of the epichoric period, further obscures many of the distinctive social and cultural traits which we may suppose were inherent in the civilisation. This is particularly so from the beginning of the 4th century B.C. when the progress of Hellenisation in the country increasingly absorbed and ultimately caused the disappearance of many of the country's indigenous elements. The epichoric language gradually gave way to Greek during the 4th century, and by the end of the century had probably ceased to be either written or spoken, at least in the major urban centres and especially when they were situated on the coast.

Up to the time of Harpagos' campaign in the second half of the 6th century, Lycia had been largely isolated from outside influences, with the likely exception of some contacts and conflicts with Rhodes, its nearest significant offshore neighbour. On the landward side the mountainous terrain of the country afforded very few means of

1. Cf. Zahle's comment: 'Our knowledge of the Lycian culture....and in fact of all extinct societies, is based on the preserved archaeological and textual evidence, which only to a small degree reflects the thinking and behaviour in a given society. A further drawback for a proper understanding is the fact that the evidence we do have may be totally random or at least very biased. The preserved evidence is often likely to make us consider certain aspects of the past to be much more important than they appeared to the ancients.' (1980, 39).

communication with the interior of Asia Minor. Even with neighbouring countries - Caria to the north west, Pisidia to the north, and Pamphylia to the north east - landward communications were very limited.² And on the seaward side the Lycian harbours seem not to have attracted any significant sea traffic before the period of the Persian domination. As far as our evidence permits us to judge, it was only in the 5th century, when the major powers of both east and west began seeking to gain control of the waterways of the eastern Mediterranean, that the strategic potential of Lycia, in particular the Lycian coast, began to come into focus.

The growth of foreign interest in Lycia was, I believe, closely associated with the increasing use that was made of the harbours with which, as Strabo comments (14.3.2), the country was well supplied. Harbour towns like Telmessos, Patara, and Antiphellos provided a number of points of contact along the south-west coast of Asia Minor between the Lycian communities and the sea-going peoples of the other Mediterranean lands. The increasing strategic importance of the harbour towns promoted Lycia's natural seaward orientation and led it to adopt a culturally mixed, cosmopolitan character much more readily than many of the countries of Asia Minor which were not accessible by sea.

We have also noted that the Lycians themselves had a significant sea-going capacity at least as early as the first decades of the 5th century when they supplied Xerxes with 50 triremes for his invasion of Greece. In all likelihood this fleet was provided by the Persian-backed dynasty at Xanthos and was based at Patara at the mouth of the Xanthos river. But it seems that it was only under Greek (and later, Roman) influence that the potential of the Lycian harbours began to be fully realised and exploited. Childs has demonstrated, for example, the likely strategic importance which both Athens and Sparta attached to the south-west corner of Asia Minor in the last decade of the Peloponnesian War (1981, 68). And early in the war the importance of gaining control of the area was reflected in the ill-fated Athenian expedition to Lycia

2. Cf. Treuber, 1887, 10-11, and note Pliny's comments on the Taurus range with regard to Lycia (nat. 5. 27. 97).

and Caria under the command of Melesander (*Thucydides* 2. 69). The Athenian commander was sent to the area partly to collect tribute from the Carians and Lycians, but also to secure the harbours against possible use by the Peloponnesians for attacking merchant ships sailing from ports further east.³

From the early 4th century onwards, several of the Lycian harbour towns grew rapidly in size, importance, and prosperity, in some cases completely eclipsing the inland cities of which they had originally been the ports. Notable amongst these was the city of Antiphellos which became one of the chief cities of Roman Lycia, far outstripping in importance its mother city Phellos. Another of the great harbour towns was Patara. Originally simply a port for Xanthos (*Appian, bell. civ.* 4. 10. 81), Patara may have become at the time of Rome's war with Antiochos III in the early 2nd century B.C. Lycia's chief city. This at least is the impression given by Livy (37. 15. 6),⁴ although elsewhere (27.17.10) Livy indicates that its harbour was not large enough to hold the combined Roman and Lycian fleets.

On the question of strategically important harbour towns, mention might also be made of the city of Phaselis which, as we have earlier noted (chapter 2, n. 47), was a Rhodian colony in origin founded in 690 B.C. For much of its existence Phaselis was not reckoned part of Lycia. In fact it is mentioned only once in connection with Lycia during the epichoric period, namely when the Lycian Perikle blockaded its harbours in order to regain custody of Charimenes of Miletos who had sought refuge there from Lycian authority (*Polyaenus, strat.* 5.42). And it was clearly distinguished from Lycia at the time of Alexander's campaigns in the winter of 334/33 B.C.⁵ For the next 166 years, Lycia

3. *Thucydides* 2.69. Note too that according to Arrian the prime object of Alexander's campaigns in Lycia and Pamphylia was to secure the southern coastline against use by the ships of the enemy (1. 24. 4). This again highlights the strategic importance of the harbour-towns in this region.

4. Where Patara is referred to as 'caput gentis'.

5. This is implied by Arrian (1. 24. 5) who is careful to distinguish two separate groups of envoys from Lycia and Phaselis who were bidden by Alexander to hand over their cities to him.

was subject in turn to Ptolemaic, Seleucid, and Rhodian control, until in 167 B.C. Rome granted it independence from Rhodes. While Phaselis may have been incorporated into Lycia and was perhaps a member of the Lycian League at this time, its attachment to Lycia was a sporadic and tenuous one.

For a short time in the first century B.C., Phaselis, along with Olympos, another eastern Lycian city, fell into the hands of the Cilician pirate Zeniketes. It became a pirate stronghold in the region until in 78 B.C. the Roman general P. Servilius Isauricus regained control of the area for the Romans.⁶ After Pompey's final suppression of the pirates, Phaselis was no doubt politically attached once more to Lycia, though at the time when Strabo wrote (late 1st century B.C. - early 1st century A.D.) it was clearly not a member of the Lycian League (see *Strabo* 14.3.9), even if, as Bean claims, it was under the Roman Empire 'in every way a wholly Lycian city' (1979b, 156).

At all events Phaselis was typical of the harbour towns on Asia Minor's south-west coast, whose importance and prosperity derived from their strategically significant location - a consideration which in the case of Phaselis, with its three harbours, outweighed the natural disadvantages of the area - notably, as Livy reports (37.23.2), an unhealthy summer climate and disease-bearing marshes. Thucydides (2.69) refers to it as a merchant base in the 5th century B.C., and Livy (37.23.1) comments on its military value because of its position on a projecting headland which provided an excellent vantage point for sighting a fleet approaching from afar; for this reason it was chosen by the Rhodians as a base against Antiochus and Hannibal in 190 B.C. Cicero (*Verr.* 4.10.21) also refers to the strategic importance of Phaselis' location which attracted the Cilician pirates because of its value as a way-station on their outward and return journeys, and led them to establish a trade alliance with the city.

But in addition to their strategic significance in times of military confrontation, the sheltered harbours of Lycia provided a number of

6. Cicero, *Verr.* 4. 10. 21, *Strabo* 14. 5. 7, *Florus* 1. 41. 5, *Eutropius* 6. 3.

convenient ports of call for commercial shipping in the eastern Mediterranean, particularly Greek shipping in a world of expanding Greek commercial enterprise along the coastlines of the eastern Mediterranean. And no doubt Greek commercial contacts with Lycia greatly facilitated the spread of Greek culture in the country and the reception into Lycian society of increasing numbers of resident Greeks.⁷

Greco-Roman Literary Interest in Lycia

In view of the range of political and cultural influences to which Lycia became increasingly subject from the 5th century B.C. onwards, we might ask to what extent the indigenous civilisation retained a distinctiveness and integrity of its own under the impact of these influences. The question is an important one, for very few of our literary sources of information about the country can be traced back before the epichoric period, when Persian and Greek influences had already begun making their mark. How far can we identify from these sources what can be regarded as indigenous features of Lycian society and civilisation? And to what extent can we assume that such features when mentioned in a specific context or related to a specific Lycian community are typical of the Lycian people as a whole?

We must always reckon with the fact that our literary information about Lycia is based on the observations or second-hand information of foreigners. This in itself presupposes an element of bias, whether intentional or not, and the likelihood of some distortion and

7. Note this within the more general context of the eastward spread of Greek cultural influences referred to by Starr: 'The stabilisation of political rule and the growth of economic activity must indeed have provided avenues for the transmission of powerful influences from the dynamic civilisation of Greece; by the 4th century B.C. this culture was exerting a fascination on parts of Phoenicia and even in conservative Egypt. In Asia Minor Hellenism had spread tentatively inland into Phrygia and Pisidia before Alexander; thereafter its hold deepened in these areas...' (1977, 105-06).

misunderstanding. Lycia did produce several writers of its own, but nothing of their work has survived, and we know of them only through references in the Greek and Roman sources. There are several references, for example, to a poet Olen, little more than a mythical figure to whom is attributed either a Lycian or a Hyperborean origin, and who was noted as a prophet and a composer of hymns sung on Delos.⁸ The most notable writer of Lycian attribution was undoubtedly Menekrates of Xanthos, a 4th century B.C. author who wrote a history of Lycia entitled *Lykiaka*.⁹ At the time he wrote it, Lycia was already strongly Hellenised, and it is not unlikely that Menekrates was either a Greek immigrant to Lycia or a first generation Lycian of Greek origin. His work was one of the sources used by Antoninus Liberalis in his account of the goddess Leto's arrival in Lycia; and as far as we can judge from this, the *Lykiaka* may have contained a significant amount of mythological material, and was almost certainly written from a Greek rather than a Lycian standpoint.

How great was Greco-Roman interest in Lycia, and how intimate was the Greco-Roman understanding of the Lycians, their origins, their customs, and their civilisation in general? As we have seen, Lycia was associated with several legendary and mythological traditions which go back at least to the beginnings of Greek literature. The most notable of these is the Greek tradition of Lycian participation in the Trojan War, as first recorded by Homer; the Lycians figure in this conflict under the leadership of Sarpedon and Glaukos as the Trojans' most important allies, and are noted for their aggressiveness and fighting qualities - a matter of some significance, since unlike the Trojans they apparently had no

8. E.g. Kallimachos, *hym.* 304-05, Herodotos 4. 35, Pausanias 1. 18. 5, 2. 13. 3, 5. 7. 8-9, 8. 21. 3, Alexander Polyhistor ap. Suidas s.v. 'Ολην. Note Treuber's comment that in Olen 'sehen wir keine einzelne Person, sondern die Hypostasierung von Einwirkungen und Entwicklungen einer Reihe von Generation, welche in eine Zeit fielen, wo das homerische Epos im ganzen schon ausgebaut war' (1887, 76-77).
9. Referred to by Antoninus Liberalis, *met.* 35 and Steph. Byz. s.v. 'Αρτύμνητος. A detailed discussion of Menekrates appears in Asheri, 1983, 125-66.

personal stake in the outcome of the conflict.

I have suggested that the tradition of Lycian participation in the Trojan War originated from Late Bronze Age conflicts in western Anatolia in which Lukka people were involved, and that memories of such conflicts were taken to Lycia by Lukka immigrants who settled the country some time after the end of the Bronze Age. The tradition of aggressive, warlike behaviour seems certainly to fit what we know of the Lukka people from the Bronze Age texts, and there may have been some carry-over of this into 1st millennium Lycia, especially in early conflicts between Lycians and Rhodians. It is to this period that Treuber refers the statement by Herakleides that the early Lycians engaged constantly in acts of plunder, probably piracy (Müller, *PHG* 2.217.15), and there is also the tradition, referred to in Chapter 2, that Patáros and Xanthos, allegedly the founders of the Lycian towns which bore their names, were originally pirates before settling in Lycia and establishing their cities there (p. 35). This recalls the Late Bronze Age text that refers to piratical enterprises by Lukka people in the eastern Mediterranean.¹⁰

Greek literary interest in legendary and mythological traditions associated with Lycia was almost certainly due to the Greek assumption that the Lycians were, in part at least, of Greek or Cretan origin. This is first illustrated by the elaborate genealogical account given by Glaukos in the *Iliad* in which Sarpedon and Glaukos are linked with Greece through their grandfather Bellerophon, originally a Greek from Argos. And a further link between Lycia and pre-Classical Greece is alleged in the tradition which makes the Lycian king Iobates (or Amphianax) father-in-law of the Argive king Proitos, thus providing part of the rationale for the mission on which Proitos sent Bellerophon to Lycia. As we have noted, the Greco-Roman sources were in no doubt that the name Lycia was Greek in origin, a name which allegedly supplanted the original name Tr̥m̥misa. Although quite different explanations were offered for the name change, the Greco-Roman

10. The letter from the king of Alasiya to the pharaoh Akhenaton, translated in Chapter 1, p. 5).

sources unequivocally associated it with Greek influence or a Greek newcomer.

Other traditions, while less Hellenocentric in character, still attribute early elements in the Lycian civilisation to an Aegean origin. Most notable is the tradition recorded first by Herodotos which relates that Sarpedon came originally to Lycia with a band of refugees from Crete. Furthermore the foundation legends of several Lycian cities also contain associations, explicit or implicit, with Crete. For example, Xanthos, the eponymous founder of the city of Xanthos, is given a Cretan or Egyptian origin by Hekataios of Miletos (ap. *Steph. Byz.* s.v. *Εὐνθοῖς*) and there is a late reference in St. Augustine to a Xanthos as the king of Crete and the abductor of Europa who became by Zeus the mother of Minos, Rhadamanthys, and Sarpedon.¹¹ And Daedala, attested as the name of a mountain and city in the Carian-Lycian borderland, was allegedly named after Daedalos, the Cretan master-craftsman who died as the result of a tortoise bite at the site where the city bearing his name was founded (*Alexander Polyhistor*, ap. *Steph. Byz.* s.v. *Δαίδαλα*).

I have referred in Chapter 2 to the possibility that there were in fact Cretan elements in the Lycian population during its formative stages (pp. 29-30). And almost certainly there was contact in the Middle Minoan III period between Cretans and the Lukka people via Millawanda/Miletos, which I have suggested lay close and perhaps adjacent to the Lukka communities in western Anatolia. Similarly Millawanda/Miletos may have been a chief point of contact between the Lukka people and the Mycenaean world.

Yet even admitting the possibility, or indeed the probability, of western influences upon the Lycian civilisation in its formative stages,

11. St. Augustine, *civ. D.* 18. 12. Arnos is also named by *Steph. Byz.* as eponymous founder of Xanthos (s.v. *Ἀρνος* cf. Eustathius, *Dion. Perieg.* 5. 129. While Bean comments that such foundation legends can be discounted because of the lateness of the sources (1978, 49), the very survival of the name Arnos in late times, obviously reflecting the epichoric name of the city, is a matter of some significance.

we must still make the point that Greco-Roman tradition either largely ignored, or was unaware of, the developments within Anatolia itself at the end of the Bronze Age which almost certainly produced the core of the Lycian civilisation. Hence the attempt to explain the name Lycia, in reality a carry-over from the Bronze Age Lukka people, in Hellenocentric terms.

We cannot of course assume that the Hellenic view of Lycia was one which the Lycians themselves shared. There is certainly no indication that the Lycians thought of themselves as Greek or even part Greek in origin, or that the Lycian civilisation was significantly influenced by Greece prior to the 5th century B.C. This is reflected in part by the persistence of indigenous place names and personal names throughout the period of the epichoric inscriptions. The Lycians invariably referred to themselves as Trĩmĩli, never as Lykioi, their personal names are with few exceptions patently Anatolian, not Greek, and have in many cases long Anatolian pedigrees, and their place names are predominantly Anatolian, even in cases where their cities are better known by their Greek names; for example, Xanthos is always called Arĩna in the epichoric inscriptions, Phellos Wehĩta, and Limyra Zẽmuri. Limyra may in fact be a Hellenised form of Zẽmuri, as Tlos is of Tlawa (which derives from the Bronze Age place name Dalawa).¹²

We note also from the Greek sources that the Xanthos river had an alternative name - the Sirbis.¹³ The name Xanthos, appropriate for the tawny colour of the river, may well have been assigned to the river under Greek literary influence. This was the alternative 'divine' name attributed to the Scamander river in the Troad (*Homer*, *Il.* 20.74), and the Lycians' close association with the Troad in the earliest literary sources may well have led, directly or indirectly, to the Greek

12. Note also Antiphellos which was, according to Pliny (*nat.* 5. 28. 100), originally called Habesos. Habesos may be a name with an Anatolian Bronze Age pedigree. It brings to mind the Late Bronze Age place-name Apasa, the name of the town or city where the royal residence of the king of Arzawa was located in the mid-14th century B.C.

13. The variant forms Sibros (*Panyasis*, ap. *Steph. Byz.* s.v. *Τρεμύλη*) and Sirmis (*Eustathius ad Hom. Il.* 12. 313) also occur.

attribution of the name Xanthos to Lycia's chief river, the river along whose banks, according to Homer, lay the kingdom of Sarpedon and Glaukos (e.g. *Homer, Il. 12.313*). According to Strabo (14.3.6), the Sirbis was the original name of the river. If in fact it was the Lycian name, it very likely remained in use amongst the Lycians themselves – although the origin of the name is quite uncertain, and it never occurs in the epichoric inscriptions.

Our literary sources contribute very little to our knowledge of Lycian society in general. The few references we have in Greco-Roman literature to Lycian social traditions, customs, and characteristics are for the most part merely incidental or anecdotal, and in at least some cases misleading or distorted in the information they provide – as illustrated by our discussion of Lycian 'matrilineality' in Chapter 5. We have no surviving comprehensive literary account of Lycia and its people, merely passing references to Lycian customs which are generally used to illustrate a particular point an author is making, usually in an altogether different context – as illustrated by the Lycian funerary customs alleged by Plutarch and Valerius Maximus (see above, pp. 127–29). And since a number of our sources of information were composed long after the epichoric period, we have to be careful not to assume too readily that what may have been true at the time of writing was also true in the period with which we are primarily concerned.

Occasionally, however, we do come across information in the literature which almost certainly does reflect a custom or fashion current in the epichoric period (as well, perhaps, as in later times). A case in point is an anecdote recorded in the pseudo-Aristotle (*oecon.* 2.2.14 = 1348a) which illustrates an apparent predilection the Lycians had for wearing their hair long. The anecdote relates that during Mausolos' overlordship of Lycia in the 4th century B.C. the king's *hyparchos* Kondalos¹⁴ proclaimed that Mausolos had ordered his deputy to send him human hair to make forelocks for his horses. To avoid submitting to the indignity of being shorn of their long hair, the

14. The name Kondalos is perhaps to be equated with the Lycian name *Khñtla-*, which appears in the genitive case (*Khñtlah*) in the inscription on the Merehi sarcophagos (TL 43. 1).

Lycians were obliged to pay a fixed sum of money (per head!) so that the hair could be obtained from Greece. The Lycians willingly complied with this condition, and a large amount of tribute was collected from them. A further, though less direct, reference to the Lycian fashion of wearing the hair long occurs in the episode in which Charimenes of Miletos attempted to escape through the land of Lycia during the time of the Lycian Perikle. In order to disguise himself, Charimenes wore a wig, presumably so that he would be indistinguishable from the native Lycians (*Polyaenus, strat.* 5.42). And we might also note that the literary evidence for the Lycian fashion of wearing the hair long receives additional support from the portrayal of Lycians in the relief sculptures of the country (see Borchhardt, 1975, 117).

In general the Lycians seem to have had a reputation as a decent, well-ordered, law-abiding people. This is indicated by Herakleides Pontikos (*Müller, FHG* 2.217.15), who notes the emphasis which they placed on integrity before the courts, as reflected in the severity of the penalty for giving false evidence. The person so offending was sold into slavery and his property was confiscated. And we might note Nikolaos Damaskenos' claim that slavery was also the penalty for theft (*ap. Stobaeus, flor.* 4.2.25 = *Jac.* 90 F 103k).

In Roman times, Strabo (14.3.5) described the Lycians as *σώφρονες*, and further comments that in spite of their excellent harbours which might have encouraged them to engage in piracy, they held aloof from the sea-plundering enterprises of the neighbouring cities on the southern coast.

In this respect they were quite different from their near neighbours the inhabitants of Phaselis, who are singled out for special treatment in the literary sources.¹⁵ For a long time the name Phaselis seems to have been synonymous with treachery and unprincipled behaviour. The Phaselitans were extremely active in mercantile ventures, as indicated in Demosthenes' prosecution of a Phaselitan Lakritos (35. 1–2), and

15. We have noted earlier that while Phaselis was from time to time politically attached to Lycia, its cultural and ethnic ties with the rest of the country were tenuous in the extreme.

developed a reputation for mendacity, breach of faith in commercial contracts, extreme litigiousness in the courts in actions covered by commercial laws, commercial fraud, and sharp practices. During the late Roman Republic, Phaselis established an alliance with the Cilician pirates, an alliance which led Cicero to use the term *Phaselis* as a byword for plunder and extortion. With reference to Messina during Verres' governorship of Sicily, Cicero (*Verr.* 4.10.23) describes the city as 'the Phaselis of this brigand and pirate of Sicily.' There is little doubt that the Phaselitans had joined willingly in the piratical enterprises of the Cilicians, and compensated themselves for living in an insalubrious natural environment (see *Livy* 37.23.1-2) by exploiting to the full the strategic advantages of their situation and capacious harbour facilities. And as we have seen, their notorious reputation goes back at least to the 4th century B.C. when it drew scathing comment from Demosthenes.

The Lycian city of Arykanda, which lay adjacent to the territory of Limyra, seems to have had a reputation similar to that of Phaselis, if we can so judge from the one surviving literary source which refers to the city. According to Agatharchides (cited by Athenaeus), the Arykandians were noted for their prodigality and extravagance; and Agatharchides (*ap. Athenaeus, deip.* 12.527F) claims that in the 2nd century B.C. they threw their support behind Mithridates (probably the son of Antiochos III who was attempting to wrest Lycia from Ptolemaic control) in the hope that in return he would grant them absolution from all their debts. (c. 197 B.C.).

* * *

It is unfortunate, though understandable, that increasing Greek awareness of and contact with Lycia occurred simultaneously with and was no doubt largely responsible for the gradual disappearance of many local traditions and customs, or their absorption by the burgeoning Greek civilisation in the area. Thus much of our information from Greek and Roman sources refers to a civilisation that had already been

substantially Hellenised. And even though Strabo (14.3.3) claims that because of their good government the Lycians remained free under the Romans, retaining their ancestral customs (τὰ πατρῶα νόμους), these customs were probably for the most part Greek in origin. As we have noted, in Roman times the Lycians were explicitly referred to as a Greek people - *Lycii, Graeci homines* (Cicero, *Verr.* 4.10.21).

Already by the end of the 4th century B.C. Lycia had become in many respects an extension of the Greek world, and by this time many features of the indigenous civilisation may already have disappeared, along perhaps with the epichoric language. Hence the majority of our Greek and Roman writers knew only of a Hellenised Lycia, or a Helleno-Romanised Lycia, and apparently believed that the Lycian people had never been any more than a refugee offshoot of the early Greek or Aegean civilisations. Even the fact that the Lycians originally had a distinctive language of their own seems to have aroused little or no interest, to judge from the absence of any reference to it in our literary sources.

Nevertheless we have seen that a few traces of what might have been long-standing indigenous Lycian customs do appear in the literary sources, if in a somewhat distorted form. And we should not too readily assume that the indigenous civilisation throughout the country uniformly gave way to the influences of Greek and Roman civilisation. The progress of these western civilisations in Lycia was probably most marked in the major urban centres and especially the important harbour towns, which would have been far more susceptible to outside influences than the smaller communities more remote from contact with the sea. In these communities there may well have been a much greater persistence of local customs and traditions. Yet by their very remoteness they were less likely to come under the notice of Greek and Roman writers, whose interest in Lycia was generally incidental, and who knew little of the country beyond the major centres, most of which had already absorbed much of the spirit and substance of the Classical civilisations by the time they make their first appearance in the literary sources.

REGISTERS OF LITERARY REFERENCES TO LYCIA

The registers which follow contain lists of references to Lycia in Greek and Roman literary sources. These lists cover the Hellenistic and Roman periods as well as the period to the end of the epichoric inscriptions.

A list of the abbreviations used in the literary references appears on pp. x-xi.

REGISTER I - AUTHORS

Aelian (2nd-3rd cent. A.D.)

nat. an. 8. 5, 12. 1: fish oracle, shrine of Apollo at Sura

11. 28: Phaselitans driven from city by wasps

16. 30: Lycian goat's fleece, used in rope making (citing Kallisthenes)

var. 1. 25. 11-12: Patara, emporium for Alexander

Agatharchides (2nd cent. B.C.)

See *Athenaeus*, *deip.* 12. 527F

Alkman (7th cent. B.C.)

1. 100-01: ref. to the (Lycian?) Xanthos river

Alexander Polyhistor (1st cent. B.C.)

ap. Steph. Byz., *passim*: towns, rivers, and mountains of Lycia

(see *Jac. FGH* 273F 48-67)

Antoninus Liberalis (2nd cent. A.D.)

met. 35: Leto's arrival in Lycia (citing Menekrates of Xanthos & Nikander of Kolophon)

Apollodoros (pseudo-) (1st cent. A.D.?)

**bib.* 2. 2. 1: legend of Proitos

2. 3. 1-2: legend of Bellerophon

3. 1. 2: Sarpedon's flight from Crete to Cilicia; appointed king of Lycia

epit. 3. 35: Sarpedon and Glaukos, allies of Troy

(*the Bibliotheca is probably a 1st cent. A.D. compilation)

Apollonius Mys (1st cent. B.C.)

see *Athenaeus*, *deip.* 15. 688E

Appian (2nd cent. A.D.)

bell. civ. 4. 7. 52, 4. 8. 60-61, 4. 9. 65, 4. 10. 76-82:

Lycia's involvement in the civil war; subjugation by Brutus

5. 1. 7: Antony releases Lycia from taxes; urges rebuilding of Xanthos

Mith. 12. 3. 20-21: subjugation of Lycia by Mithridates

12. 4. 24: Telmessos separate from Lycia, and Lycia allied with Rhodes during Mithridatic war

12. 4. 27: Mithridates' siege of Patara

12. 9. 61: Sulla liberates Lycia from Mithridates

12. 9. 62: ref. to the liberation of Lycia from Rhodes

Syr. 11. 6. 32: Lycian participation in the battle of Sipylos

11. 7. 44: Lycia assigned to Rhodes after battle of Magnesia

11. 9. 53: Antigonos becomes satrap of Phrygia, Lycia, and Pamphylia after Alexander's death

Aristotle (4th cent. B.C.)

hist. an. 5. 16 (= 548b): Lycian sponges

8. 28 (= 605b): shearing of goats in Lycia

oecon. 2. 2. 14 (=1348a) (*pseudo-Arist.*): Mausolos' demand for the Lycians' long hair

See *Photius*, *bib.* 161

Arrian (2nd cent. A.D.)

anab. 1. 24. 3-6: Alexander's conquest of Lycia

1. 25. 7-10, 4. 3. 7, 4. 4. 3: Alexander consults Aristander, seer of Telmessos

1. 26. 1: Alexander's route from Lycia to Pamphylia

2. 3. 3: Gordios consults seers of Telmessos

2. 20. 2: Lycian fleet supports Alexander against Dareios

3. 6. 6: Alexander appoints Nearchos satrap of Lycia and neighbouring territories

4. 3. 7: Alexander employs a Lycian, Pharnuches, as his interpreter in Persia

Artemidoros (2nd-1st cent. B.C.)

See *Athenaeus*, *deip.* 8. 333F

See *Strabo* 14. 3. 3

Athenaeus (2nd-3rd cent. A.D.)

deip. 1. 13F: honours paid to Sarpedon at Lycian banquets

5. 185B-C: hospitality accorded to Bellerophon by Lycian king (cf. *Iliad* 6. 174)

7. 297E-98A: Phaselis founded by Lakios (citing Heropythos and Philostephanos)

8. 333D-F: fish oracle at Sura (citing Polycharmos and Artemidoros).

8. 347 A-B: Lycians participate in cooking fish of prodigious size (citing Ephippos)

8. 350A: Phaselis reckoned as part of Pamphylia; villainous character of population (citing Stratonikos)

12. 527F: prodigality of inhabitants of Arykanda (citing Agatharchides)

14. 657E: fine quality of Lycian hams (citing Strabo)

15. 688E: attar of roses produced in Phaselis (citing Apollonius Mys)

Augustine (4th - 5th cent. A.D.)

civ. D. 18. 12: Xanthos, king of Crete, abductor of Europa

Bacchylides (5th cent. B.C.)

10. 64-70: conflict between Proitos and Akrisios

10. 77-81: walls of Tiryns built by the Cyclopes

12. 147-48: Apollo Loxias, designated as *Λυκίων ἄναξ*

Celsus (1st cent. A.D.)

5. 26. 30, 6. 7. 2, 8. 6. 2: use of *lycium* (boxthorn juice) for medicinal purposes

Cicero

Att. 6. 5: Lycians in army of Cicero during his governorship of Cilicia

fam. 12. 4. 1, 12. 15. 2 & 5: Dolabella's fleet near the Lycian coast

div. 1. 41: seers of Carian Telmessos, which is noted for its haruspicy

leg. agr. 1. 5, 2. 50: Lycian territory converted into *ager publicus*

Verr. 1. 38. 95: Verres' dealings with Lycia

4. 10. 21 & 23: Phaselis inhabited by Lycians, 'a Greek people'; Phaselis partnered with Cilician pirates, and noted for its rapacity

Clement (of Alexandria) (2nd - 3rd cent. A.D.)

protr. 41: statues of Zeus and Apollo at Patara

Constantine Porphyrogenitus (10th cent. A.D.)

them. 1. 14: Phoenike, name of town and neighbouring river in Lycia
14. 37: Myra, the 'myrrh-breathing' city, seat of Nikolaos

Curtius (Quintus C. Rufus) (1st cent. A.D.)

5. 4. 10-13: Alexander uses Lycian as guide in Persia
10.10. 2: Antigonos becomes satrap of Lycia and Pamphylia

Demosthenes (4th cent. B.C.)

35. 1-5: unsavoury character of the inhabitants of Phaselis.

Dio Cassius (2nd-3rd cent. A.D.)

47. 33. 1-2, 47. 34. 1-6, 47. 36. 3-4: Lycia's involvement in the civil war; subjugation of Lycia by Brutus
55. 10. 9: death of Gaius Caesar at Limyra (3 A.D.)
60. 17. 3-4: Lycia becomes a Roman province
63. 26. 5: flood in Lycia during reign of Nero
65. 9. 2: Lycia on Vespasian's route from Palestine to Italy
68. 17. 3: Lycia on Trajan's route to Antioch

Dio Cocceianus (Chrysostomus) (1st-2nd cent. A.D.)

31. 101: revenue drawn by Rhodes from Caria and part of Lycia

Diodoros Sikulos (1st cent. B.C.)

5. 56. 1: Telchines flee from Rhodes to Lycia
5. 79. 3: Sarpedon's conquest of Lycia (grandfather of the Sarpedon who participated in the Trojan War)
5. 81. 2: Xanthos, son of Triopas, king of Pelasgians of Argos, seizes part of Lycia
6. 9. 1: the legend of Bellerophon
11. 2. 2: Xerxes' shipbuilding programme; includes Lycian fleet

11. 3. 7: Lycians contribute 40 ships to Xerxes' fleet
11. 60. 4: Kimon wins over the Lycians 'by persuasion'
12. 4. 5: Phaselis established as limit of Persian territory
15. 90. 3: Lycia's participation in the satrap rebellion
17. 28. 1: siege of Marmares people (near Lycia)
17. 68. 4-7: Alexander uses Lycian as guide in Persia
18. 61. 4-5: Lycian mercenaries secured for service of Eumenes
19. 29. 3, 19. 69. 1, 19. 82. 4: Lycian contingents in army of Antigonos
19. 64. 5: Antigonos uses Patara as a naval base
20. 27. 1: Ptolemy I captures Phaselis and Xanthos
20. 93. 3: Patara under control of Demetrios, son of Antigonos

Dioscorides Pedanius (1st cent. A.D.)

mat. med. 1. 100: use of *lycium* (boxthorn juice) for medicinal purposes

Ephippos (5th-4th cent. B.C.)

See Athenaeus, *deip.* 8. 347A-B

Ephoros (c. 4th cent. B.C.)

See Strabo 14. 1. 6

Bratosthenes (3rd - 2nd cent. B.C.)

See Pliny, *nat.* 5. 33. 127

Etymologicon Magnum

219 s.v. Γάγαι: Gagae founded by Rhodians; two versions of foundation legend given

Euripides (5th cent. B.C.)

Alk. 114: implicit ref. to Lycian oracle?

Rhes. 224 (*pseudo-Euripides?*): ref. to temple of Apollo in Lycia
Sthen. frags. 661-72 (*Trag. Graec. Frag.*, ed. Nauck²):
Bellerophon's mission to Lycia

Eustathius (12th cent. A.D.)

Dion. Perieg. 129: the role of Pataros and Xanthos as brigands

Eutropius (4th cent. A.D.)

6. 3: P. Servilius Isauricus' attack on Lycian cities

Florus (1st-2nd cent. A.D.)

epit. 1. 41. 5: P. Servilius Isauricus' conquest of Cilician pirate strongholds at Phaselis and Olympos

Hekataios (6th-5th cent. B.C.)

ap. Steph. Byz. s.v. Εἰνός: eponymous hero Xanthos of Cretan or Egyptian origin

ap. Steph. Byz. s.v. Κορύδαλλα: Korydalla a Rhodian foundation

Herodotos (5th cent. B.C.)

1. 28: Lycians and Cilicians not subdued by Kroisos

1. 78: Telmessian seers consulted by Kroisos
1. 84: Telmessian seers consulted by Meles
1. 147: Lycian descendants of Glaukos chosen as kings by Ionians
1. 171: Harpagos' expedition into s.w. Asia Minor
1. 173, 7. 92: Cretan origin of Lycians; Sarpedon's migration to Lycia with the Termlai; Lycia subsequently named after Lykos, son of Pandion; Lycian customs (espec. the use of matronymics)
1. 176: Harpagos' conquest of Xanthos
1. 182: the oracle at Patara
2. 178: Phaselis of Dorian origin
3. 4: capture of Phanes (Halikarnassian in military service of Amasis) in Lycia after flight from Egypt
- 3.90: Lycia included in first Persian nomos
4. 35: Olen of Lycia, composer of songs sung on Delos
4. 45: Europa's travels from Phoenicia to Crete, and thence to Lycia
- 7.77: Milyans' war equipment
- 7.92: Lycians contribute 50 ships to Xerxes' fleet; war equipment of Lycians
- 7.98: Kybernis, commander of Lycian fleet

Heropythos (date uncertain)
See Athenaeus, *deip.* 297E-F

Hesiod (8th/7th cent. B.C.)
theog. 319-25: birth of Chimaera; its destruction by Bellerophon

Hesychios (of Alexandria) (5th cent. A.D.?)
s.v. Παταρά(η)ς: Patara, city and mountain of Lycia

Hierokles (6th cent. A.D.)
synecd. 683-85: list of towns of Lycia

Hieronymus (St. Jerome) (c. 4th-5th cent. A.D.)
comm. in Daniel 11. 15: Antiochos III's conquest of Lycia and capture of Myra, Phaselis, Limyra, Patara, and Andriake (197 B.C.)

- Homer (8th-7th cent. B.C.)
11. 2. 826-27: Pandaros, son of Lykaon, leader of a contingent of Trojans; associated with Apollo
 2. 876-77: Sarpedon and Glaukos, leaders of the Lycian contingent at Troy
 4. 86-140: Pandaros' unsuccessful attempt to kill Menelaos
 5. 95-105: Pandaros wounds Diomedes
 5. 166-240: Aeneas and Pandaros prepare for onslaught on Diomedes
 5. 471-93: Sarpedon rebukes Hektor for the Trojans' lack of aggression
 5. 628-98: duel between Sarpedon and Tlepolemos; slaughter of Lycians by Odysseus
 6. 119-236: Glaukos' meeting with Diomedes; the legend of Bellerophon
 7. 13-16: Glaukos strikes down Iphinoos, son of Dexios

8. 173-83, 11. 286, 13. 150-54. 425-28, 15. 484-99, 17. 183-87: Hektor urges on the allies of Troy (incl. the Lycians)
12. 101-04: Sarpedon chooses Glaukos and Asteropaeus as his companions in arms.
12. 310-471: Sarpedon and Glaukos lead the Lycians in battle
16. 328: the Chimaera (bred by Amisodaros)
16. 419-526: Sarpedon wounded in conflict with Patroklos; his final address to Glaukos, and his death
16. 513-31: Glaukos' wound healed by Apollo
16. 532-683: the battle for the body of Sarpedon
17. 140-82: Glaukos rebukes Hektor and threatens to withdraw the Lycian contingent; Hektor's reply

Horace (1st cent. B.C.)
carm. 1. 21. 5-8: Leto associated with Mt. Kragos (in Lycia)
3. 4. 61-64: Apollo associated both with Delos and Patara

Hyginus (2nd cent. A.D.?)
fab. 57: the legend of Bellerophon
106. 2: Sarpedon, son of Jupiter and Europa, killed by Patroklos
178. 1: the legend of Europa

Isocrates (436-338 B.C.)
paneg. 153: Agesilaos captures Kisthene (= Megiste)
161: Lycia unsubdued by any Persian

Justin (3rd cent. A.D.?)
hist. phil. 13. 4. 15: Alexander assigns Lycia (and Pamphylia) to Nearchos
13. 6. 14: Eumenes obtains possession of Lycia (along with Paphlagonia, Caria, and Phrygia)

Kallimachos (c. 3rd cent. B.C.)
hym. 4. 304-05: Olen, epic poet, of Lycian or Hyperborean origin
ap. Steph. Byz. s.v. Δολύχνη: island near Lycia.

Kallinos (7th cent. B.C.)
See Strabo 13. 5. 8

Kallisthenes (4th cent. B.C.)
See Aelian, *nat. an.* 16. 30.
See Strabo 13. 4. 8.

Kleanthes (4th - 3rd cent. B.C.)
See Macrobius, *sat.* 1. 17. 36

Ktesias (5th cent. B.C.)
See Pliny, *nat.* 2. 110. 236

Livy (1st cent. B.C. - 1st cent. A.D.)
33. 19.11: Lycia under Ptolemaic rule (197 B.C.)

33. 41. 5, 37. 15. 6-8, 37. 16. 1-14, 37. 17. 1 & 10, 37. 22. 3 & 5, 37. 23. 1-2, 37. 24. 9 & 11-13, 37. 40. 14, 37. 45. 2, 38. 39. 2-4: Lycia's involvement in Rome's war with Antiochos III (190 B.C.)
37. 23. 1: Phaselis' strategic location and unhealthy climate
37. 55. 5, 37. 56. 5, 38. 39. 13: Roman senate assigns Lycia (and Caria) to Rhodes (except for Telmessos)
37. 56. 2, 38. 39. 16: Milyas one of the territories taken from Eumenes by Prusias and restored to Eumenes by Romans (189 B.C.)
41. 6. 8-12: Lycian envoys complain to Roman senate of Rhodian brutality towards Lycia (178 B.C.)
41. 25. 8: Lycia at war with Rhodes (178 B.C.)
42. 14. 8: Perseus accuses Eumenes before Roman senate of stirring the Lycians against Rhodes
44. 15. 1: Roman senate grants Lycia (and Caria) independence from Rhodes (169 B.C. - but Polybius 30. 5. 12 shows date should be 167 B.C.)

Lucan (1st cent. A.D.)
bell. civ. 8. 249-54: Phaselis, a city of Pamphylia (*sic*), occupied by Pompey; greatly reduced population at the time

Lucian (1st cent. A.D.)
bis accus. 1: implicit ref. to oracle of Apollo at Xanthos (*sic*)
dial. mer 14. 2 & 3: gilded sandals from Patara
dial. mort. 24: Mausolos ruler of part of Lycia (or Lydia? see Houwink ten Cate, 1965, 13, n. 4)

Macrobius (4th - 5th cent. A.D.)
sat. 1. 17. 36: discussion of epithet *Lykios* applied to Apollo (citing also Kleantes who derives name *Lycia* from *lupus* (Greek *λύκος*))

Makarios (4th cent. A.D.)
 8. 26: trafficking in offices in Phaselis

Marinos (late antiquity)
vita Procli 6-8: in praise of education received by Proclus at grammaticians' school at Xanthos

Maximus Tyrius (1st cent. A.D.)
diss. 8. 8: the fire phenomenon and temple on Lycian Mt. Olympos

Mela, Pomponius (1st cent. A.D.)
chor. 1. 14. 79: Phaselis founded by Mopsos on Pamphylian border
 1. 15. 80: Lycia named after Lykos, son of Pandion; haunted by Chimaera
 1. 15. 82: ref. to Apollo's oracle at Patara, to Xanthos, Kragos, Telmessos

Menander (4th - 3rd cent. B.C.)
asp. 23-114: Greek freebooting expedition to Lycia and battle by the Xanthos river

Menekrates (of Xanthos) (4th cent. B.C.)
ap. Steph. Byz. s.v. 'Αρτύμνητος : colonisation of Pinara by elders from Xanthos; derivation of name Pinara
 See Antoninus Liberalis, *met.* 35

Nikander (of Kolophon) (2nd cent. B.C.?)
 See Antoninus Liberalis, *met.* 35

Nikolaos Damaskenos (1st cent. B.C.)
ap. Stobaeus, flor. 4. 2. 25 (*Jac.* 90F 103k): Lycian customs, incl. the use of matronymics

Nymphis (of Heraklea in Bithynia) (3rd cent. B.C.?)
 See Plutarch, *mul. virt.* 248D.

Orosius (4th-5th cent. A.D.)
 5. 23. 21-22: P. Servilius Isauricus' conquests in s.w. Asia Minor, including Lycia

Ovid (1st cent. B.C. - 1st cent. A.D.)
met. 6. 317-81: Leto's arrival in Lycia
 9. 644-48: the wanderings of Byblis (daughter of Miletos) through Caria and Lycia.

Panyasis (5th cent. B.C.)
ap. Steph. Byz. s.v. Τρεμύλη : Lycian foundation legend

Parthenius (1st cent. B.C.)
erot. 5: the legend of Leukippos, son of Xanthios, descendant of Bellerophon

Pausanias (2nd cent. A.D.)
 1. 18. 5, 2. 13. 3, 5. 7. 8-9, 8. 21. 3, 9. 27. 2: the poet Olen
 1. 19. 3: name change of *Termilae* to *Lykioi* due to Lykos, son of Pandion
 2. 4. 1: Pegasus presented to Bellerophon by Athene
 2. 4. 2: Bellerophon's journey to Lycia
 2. 7. 1: earthquake affecting Lycia, Caria, and Rhodes
 2. 25. 7: conflict between Proitos and Akrisios
 2. 25. 8: walls of Tiryns built by the Cyclopes
 3. 3. 8: spear of Achilles in temple of Athene at Phaselis
 5. 8. 11: Lycian Tlepolemos a victor in the 131st Olympiad (265 B.C.)
 7. 3. 7: Lycians' kinship with Cretans; Sarpedon's flight to Lycia; Lycians included in the population of Erythrae
 7. 21. 13: divination at Kyaneae (seat of Apollo Thyrsos)
 8. 43. 4: cities of Lycia, Caria, Kos, and Rhodes destroyed by earthquake; restored by Antoninus Pius
 9. 41. 1: bronze bowl made by Hephaestus and dedicated by Telephos in temple of Apollo at Patara
 10. 27. 2: Hecuba brought to Lycia by Apollo (citing Stesichoros, *Ilipersis*)

Philostephanos (3rd cent. B.C.)
See Athenaeus, *deip.* 7. 297F-98A

Photius (9th cent. A.D.)
bib. 161: ref. to a *politeia* of the Lycians written by Aristotle
176: see Theopompos

Pindar (6th - 5th cent. B.C.)
Isthm. 7. 44-47: the laming of Bellerophon
Ol. 13. 60-92: legend of Bellerophon

Pliny (Elder) (1st cent. A.D.)
nat. 2. 97. 211: earthquakes in Lycia always followed by 40 days of fine weather
2. 110. 236, 5. 28. 100: the fire phenomenon of Mt. Chimaera and the mts. of Hephaestos in e. Lycia
5. 26. 96: Phaselis located in Pamphylia
5. 26. 97: Taurus range in relation to Lycia
5. 28. 100-01: the towns and rivers of Lycia
5. 33. 127: the Solymians listed by Bratosthenes among extinct Asiatic tribes
9. 69. 149, 31. 47. 131: therapeutic powers of sponges found around walls of Antiphellos (2nd ref. cites Polybius and Trogus)
12. 5. 9: plane tree of prodigious size in Lycia
12. 61. 132, 13. 11. 52, 16. 59. 137: Lycian cedars
13. 27. 88: claim by Mucianus (when governor of Lycia) to have read in a certain temple a letter written by Sarpedon at Troy; ref. to the wooden tablets given to Bellerophon
14. 9. 74: Telmessos noted for its wine
21. 11. 24: the lilies of Phaselis
21. 17. 31 & 33: (Lycian) Mt. Olympos noted for saffron
25. 30. 67: *lycium* (boxthorn juice) obtained from centaury plant
30. 2. 6: Telmessos designated as 'urbs religiosissima'
31. 18. 22: divination at Limyra
32. 8. 17: fish divination at Myra
35. 57. 197: clay found in vicinity of Bubon
36. 34. 141: jet (*gagates lapis*) derives name from Gages (*sic*), district and river in Lycia

Plutarch (1st-2nd cent. A.D.)
Alex. 17. 4. 5: bronze tablet (found at Letoon?), allegedly foretelling destruction of Persian empire, spurs Alexander in his conquest of s. coast of Asia Minor
37. 1-2: Alexander uses Lycian as guide in Persia
Brut. 30-32: Brutus' conquest of Xanthos and Patara
consol. Apoll. 112F-113A: Lycians assume female garb in mourning to indicate that grief is unmanly
def. orac. 421D-E: the cult of Kronos amongst the Solymians and the Lycians
Kim. 12. 3-4: Kimon's siege and capture of Phaselis
mul. virt. 247F-48A: pirate fleet from Lycian colony near Zeleia, under command of Chimarrhus
248A-C: Bellerophon' exploits

248B-D: explanations of the Chimaera tradition
sol. an. 976C: fish divination at Sura

Polyaenus (2nd cent. A.D.)
strat. 5. 42: Charimenes' attempt to escape from Lycia in time of Lycian Perikle

Polybius (2nd cent. B.C.)
5. 27. 5: city in the Milyas called 'the city of Cretans'
21. 24. 7-8, 21. 45. 8, 22. 5, 25. 4-5: dispute between Lycians and Rhodians over assignation of Lycia to Rhodes after the battle of Magnesia
21. 45. 10: Telmessos and Milyas amongst the territories reassigned to Eumenes by Roman senate
27. 7. 6: dispute between Rhodians and Eumenes over forts and territory on borders of Rhodian Peraea
30. 5. 12 & 16: Roman senate grants Lycia independence from Rhodes (167 B.C.)
30. 9. 1-12: Polyaratos' unsuccessful attempt to gain sanctuary in Phaselis (3rd Macedonian War)
30. 31. 4-5: Rhodians complain of loss of Lycia (and Caria)
31. 4. 1-3: Rhodians ask Roman senate to allow Rhodian citizens to continue holding property in Lycia and Caria
ap. Pliny, nat. 31. 47. 131: curative properties of Lycian sponges

Polycharmos (2nd cent. B.C.?)
ap. Steph. Byz. s.v. Σοῦρα: oracular seat at Sura (*Jac.* 770 F 3)
ap. Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἰλαρὺς: city of Lycia (*Jac.* 770 F 4)
See Athenaeus, *deip.* 8. 333D-E (*Jac.* 770 F 1)

Polyzelos (4th-3rd cent. B.C.)
See Timachidas, *Lind. Chron.* C XXIII

Probus (1st cent. A.D.)
Verg. Georg. 1. 378: spring in Lycia called Melas, and associated with arrival of Leto.

Ptolemy (Claudius Ptolemaeus) (2nd cent. A.D.)
5. 3: the towns, rivers, and mountains of Lycia

Quintus Smyrnaeus (4th cent. A.D.)
3. 214-85, 14. 135-36: Glaukos' conflict in Trojan War with Aias, son of Aeacus; Glaukos' death
4. 1-12: burial of Glaukos beneath Mt. Telandros
4. 289-90: Sarpedon slain by Patroklos
8. 84: the heights of Lycia
8. 101-07: the death in the Trojan War of Lycians from Limyra, Phoenike, Massicytus, and the Chimaera region
10. 147-66: Skylakeus' flight from Trojan War, and his death at hands of women of Tlos; his burial in Tlos beside Bellerophon's tomb
11. 20-21: Lycian Laodamas slain by Neoptolemos in Trojan War
11. 22-26: Leto gives birth to Apollo and Artemis in Lycia; creates Xanthos river in her birth pangs

Schol. ad Homer

ad *Il.* 4. 101: birth of Apollo in Lycia; *Λυκηγευῆς*, epithet of Apollo
6. 155: Cassandra, alternative name of Philonoe (daughter of Lycian king Iobates)

Seneca (1st cent. A.D.)

nat. quaest. 3. 25. 11: alleged fertility-inducing qualities of the waters of Lycia

Servius (4th cent. A.D.)

Verg. Aen. 3. 332: Patara founded by Lykadius, son of Apollo and nymph Lycia

- 4. 143: mildness of Lycian winter; Apollo spends 6 winter months at Patara, 6 summer months at Delos
- 4. 377: various explanations of Apollo's epithet *λυκῖος* and the name *Lycia*; suggested conflict with Telchines
- 6. 288: the legend of Bellerophon and the Chimaera; Mt. Chimaera located in Cilicia

Verg. Georg. 1. 378: Leto's arrival in Lycia

Skylax (4th cent. B.C.)

100: the towns and physical features of Lycia

Solinus (2nd-3rd cent. A.D.)

- 39. 1: Mt. Chimaera and the town Hephaestia
- 39. 2: decline of Olympos until merely a fortress

Sophokles (5th cent. B.C.)

El. 7-8: Apollo identified as the 'wolf-slayer' (popular explanation of epithet *λύκειος*)

Oed. 205-08: Apollo and Artemis associated with Lycia

Statius (1st cent. A.D.)

Theb. 8. 200: ref. to Apollo's oracle at Patara

Stephanus Byzantinus (6th cent. A.D.)

passim: towns, rivers, and mountains of Lycia

Stesichoros (7th-6th cent. B.C.?)

See Pausanias 10. 27. 2

Stobaeus (5th cent. A.D.)

flor. 4. 2. 25: Lycian customs (citing Nikolaos Dam.)

Strabo

- 1. 2. 10: Solymians occupied peaks of Taurus around Lycia
- 8. 6. 11: Walls of Tiryns built by the Cyclopes who were Lycian in origin
- 11. 12. 2: Taurus range begins in Caria and Lycia
- 12. 4. 6, 13. 1. 7: the 'northern Lycia' where Zeleia was located; subject to Pandaros
- 12. 8. 4: discussion of Homer's 'two groups of Lycians'

12. 8. 5, 14. 3. 10: Sarpedon (from Cretan Miletos) founds Miletos in Asia Minor; Termilae, Solymians, and Milyans identical according to one account, but Solymians and Lycians to be distinguished according to Homer

12. 8. 5-6: Lycia named after Lykos, son of Pandion; Bellerophon's conflict with the Solymians and the Amazons

13. 4. 8: tradition that Lycians participated in the capture of Sardis

13. 4. 16: association between the Solymians and Termessos

13. 4. 17: the nature and extent of Kibyra; Murena's suppression of the Moagetid tyranny there

14. 1. 6: Miletos founded by Sarpedon with colonists from Crete; formerly inhabited by the Leleges (citing Ephoros)

14. 2. 1: topography of Lycia and neighbouring districts

14. 2. 2, 14. 3. 1-2: Daedala, boundary of Rhodian Peraea and mt. in Lycia

14. 3. 2: nature and extent of Lycian coastline; character of Lycians

14. 3. 3: the Lycian League; general comments on the Lycians

14. 3. 4: capture of Telmessos and Telmessis by Eumenes; recovered by Lycians after fall of Eumenes' kingdom

14. 3. 4-9: cities, mountains, and rivers of Lycia

14. 5. 23: Lycians in Trojan Catalogue

14. 5. 7: P. Servilius Isauricus' capture of Zeniketes' stronghold at Olympos

Stratonikos (5th-4th cent. B.C.)

See Athenaeus, *deip.* 8. 349F

Suetonius (1st-2nd cent. A.D.)

Claud. 25: establishment of Lycia as a Roman province

Ves. 8: Vespasian re-establishes Lycia-Pamphylia as a Roman province after a period of independence under Nero and Galba

Suidas (lexicon) (10th cent. A.D.)

s.v. *Ἰωλῆς*: the poet Olen (citing Alex. Polyhist.)

Theodoretus (5th cent. A.D.)

Graec. aff. cur. 3. 57: cites Plutarch, *def. Orac.* 421 D-E

Theokritos (4th - 3rd cent. B.C.)

17.89: Lycia under control of Ptolemy (II)

Timachidas (1st cent. B.C. - 1st cent. A.D.)

Lind. Chron. C XXIII: campaign of Kleoboulos of Lindos against Lycia (citing Timokritos and Polyzelos)
C XXIV: Phaselis founded by Lakios (citing Xenagoras)

Theophrastos (4th-3rd cent. B.C.)

hist. plant. 3. 12. 3: the Lycian cedar

4. 5. 2: the cypress in Lycia

Theopompos (4th cent. B.C.)

ap. Photius, bib. 176, p. 120 a 14. 15 (*Jac. II B 115, no. 113*) Rhodiapolis, named after Rhode, daughter of Mopsos

p. 120a 14.17: Lycian Perikle's conquest of Telmessos (Jac. ref. as above)

Thucydides (5th cent. B.C.)

2. 69: Melesander's Lycian expedition

8. 41. 4: Athenian ships off Lycian coast to keep watch for approaching Peloponnesian fleet

Timagenes (1st cent. B.C.)

ap. Steph. Byz. s.v. Μελύασι: Milyans formerly called Solymians

Timokritos (3rd cent. B.C. ?)

See Timachidas, Lind. Chron. C XXIII

Trogus (1st cent. B.C. - 1st cent. A.D.)

See Pliny, nat. 31. 47. 131

Valerius Maximus (1st cent. A.D.)

2. 6. 13: Lycians assume female garb when in mourning

Vergil (1st cent.)

Aen. 1. 113: Lycian ship in Aeneas' fleet

4. 143-44, 4. 346, 4. 377: implicit refs. to Apollo's oracle at Patara

6. 288: the Chimaera

7. 816, 8. 166, 11. 773: archery associated with Lycia

Xenagoras (3rd cent. B.C.)

See Timachidas, Lind. Chron. C XXIV

Zenobius (2nd cent. A.D.)

cent. 2. 87: Bellerophon's flight to Proitos

6. 36: inhabitants of Phaselis honour hero Kylabras with offering of pickled fish

REGISTER II - PLACE NAMES

(A list of Lycian place names attested in the Greek and Roman literary sources. Multiple sources are given in chronological order.)

Aedesa r.

river in Lycia which flows past Choma: Pliny, nat. 5. 28. 101

Aesepos r.

river in Troad on which Zeleia, home of Pandaros, located: Homer, Il. 2. 825, Strabo 12. 4. 6, 13. 1. 7

Amelas

town in Lycia: Pliny, nat. 5. 28. 101 (but see Robert, 1962, 161-69)

Andriake

town in Lycia: Ptolemy 5. 3. 3.

seaport of Myra; harbour closed by chain (in 1st cent. B.C.): Appian, bell. civ. 4. 10. 82

captured by Antiochos III in conquest of Lycia (197 B.C.): Hieronymus, comm. in Daniel 11. 15.

= Andria?: Pliny, nat. 5. 28. 100

Antikragos mt.

steep mt. in Lycia: Strabo 14. 3. 5

Antiphellos

town in Lycia: Alexander Polyhistor ap. Steph. Byz.

s.v. Ἀντιφελλος: Strabo 14. 3. 7, Ptolemy 5. 3. 3.

formerly called Habesos: Pliny, nat. 5. 28. 100.

noted for the sponges found around its walls: Pliny, nat. 9. 69. 149, 31. 47. 131 (citing also Polybius and Trogus)

Aperiae

town in Lycia: Pliny, nat. 5. 28. 100, Ptolemy 5. 3. 3

Araxa

town in Lycia: Alex. Polyhist. ap. Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀραξα, Ptolemy 5. 3. 5

Arna

former name of city of Xanthos: Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀρνα

Arsinoe

name given to Patara by Ptolemy Philadelphus: Strabo 14. 3. 6.

Arykanda

town in Lycia, adjacent to territory of Limyra, noted for its prodigality: Athenaeus, deip. 12. 527F (citing Agatharchides)

Arykandos r.

river in Lycia, tributary of the Limyros r.: Pliny, nat. 5. 28. 100

Ascandiandalis

town in Lycia: *Pliny, nat. 5. 28. 101* (but see Robert, 1962, 161-69)

Balbura

town in Lycia, part of district of Kabalia: *Pliny, nat. 5. 28.*

101, Ptolemy 5. 3. 8

part of district of Kibyra, but assigned to Lycia by Murena at end of Moagetid tyranny: *Strabo 13. 4. 17*

Bubon

town in Lycia, part of district of Kabalia: *Pliny, nat. 5. 28.*

101, Ptolemy 5. 3. 8

part of district of Kibyra, but assigned to Lycia by Murena: *Strabo 13. 4. 17*

clay found in its vicinity; *Pliny, nat. 35. 57. 196*

Canas

town in Lycia: *Pliny, nat. 5. 28. 101*

Chelidonian islands

situated off coast of Lycia and Pamphylia: *Skylax 100, Strabo*

14. 2. 1, Ptolemy 5. 3. 9 Quintus Smyrn. 3. 234-35

c. 6 stades from shore and 5 from one another; 3 in number; ^f

starting point, acc. to most writers, of Taurus mts (which Strabo believes begin in Rhodian Peraea): *Strabo 14. 3. 8*

Chimaera (mt. and natural phenomenon)

(in e. Lycia) unquenchable nature of fire: *Pliny, nat. 2. 110.*

236 (citing Ktesias of Knidos; cf. comments on mts. of

Hephaestos, *nat. 5. 28. 100*), *Solinus 39. 1*

ravine near the Kragos range (w. Lycia); associated with the

Chimaera myth: *Strabo 14. 3. 5*

near Massicytus range: *Quintus Smyrn. 8. 107.*

mt. in Cilicia with burning peak; origin of the myth: *Servius,*

Verg. Aen. 6. 288

Chorna

town in Lycia: *Pliny, nat. 5. 28. 101, Ptolemy 5. 3. 7*

Daedala

town and mt. in Lycia, named after Cretan Daedalos: *Alex.*

Polyhist. ap. Steph. Byz. s.v. Δαίδαλα, Strabo 14. 3. 2,

14. 3. 4. Ptolemy 5. 3. 2

beginning of Rhodian Peraea: *Strabo 14. 2. 2, 14. 3. 1*

one of the fortresses of the Peraea; Rhodian fleet relieves blockade in

war with Antiochos III (190 B.C.): *Livy 37. 22. 3*

town in Caria (sic): *Pliny, nat 5. 29. 103*

Doliche/Dolichiste

island near Lycia: *Alex. Polyhist, Kallimachos ap. Steph. Byz.*

s.v. Δολιχί, Ptolemy 5. 3. 9

Eleutherai

town in Lycia: *Steph. Byz. s.v. 'Ελευθεραί*

Ereuates

town in Lycia: *Steph. Byz. s.v. 'Ερευάτης*

Erymnai

town in Lycia: *Alex Polyhist. ap. Steph. Byz. s.v. 'Ερυμναί*

Eunia

grove in Lycia on site of Kandyba: *Pliny, nat. 5. 28. 101*

Gagae

town in Lycia: *Skylax 100, Alex. Polyhist. ap. Steph. Byz.*

s.v. Γάγαι

mt. settlement in e. Lycia, grouped with Korydalla and

Rhodiapolis: *Pliny, nat. 5. 28. 100*

foundation legend (2 versions): *Etym. Magn. 219 s.v. Γάγαι*

Gages r.

river in Lycia from which the name *Gages lapis* (jet) derives:

Pliny, nat. 36. 34. 141

Habesos

former name of Antiphellos: *Pliny. nat. 5. 28. 100*

Hephaestium

associated with the fire phenomenon of e. Lycia: *Skylax 100,*

Pliny. nat. 5. 28. 100, Solinus 39. 1

Hephaestos range

range in e. Lycia; flare up when touched with torch: *Pliny,*

nat. 2. 110. 236

Hylami

town in Lycia: *Alex. Polyhist. ap. Steph. Byz.*

s.v. 'Υλαμου

Idyros

town in Lycia: *Skylax 100*

Kabalia

district in Lycia comprising 3 cities - Oenoanda, Balbura,

Bubon: *Pliny, nat. 5. 28. 101, Ptolemy 5. 3. 8*

population alleged to be Solymian: *Strabo 13. 4. 16*

Kalynda

named as town of Lycia by *Ptolemy 5. 3. 2* (otherwise assigned to

Caria, e.g. *Herodotos 1. 172, 8. 87, Pliny, nat. 5. 29 103*)

Kandyba

town in Lycia: *Pliny nat. 5. 28. 101*

assigned (wrongly) to Milyas district: *Ptolemy 5. 3. 7*

Karmylessos

town in Lycia in the Antikragos range: *Strabo* 14. 3. 5

Kibyra

in Phrygian territory: *Pliny, nat.* 5. 29. 105
separated from Lycia by Taurus range: *Strabo* 14. 2. 1
accessible by pass from Lycia: *Strabo* 14. 3. 3

Kisthene (= Megiste?)

ref. in *Strabo* 14. 3. 7
captured by Agesilaos: *Isocrates, paneg.* 153

Klimax mt.

mt. in Lycia near Phaselis: *Strabo* 14. 3. 9

Kochlioussa

island near Lycia: *Alex Polyhist. ap. Steph Byz. s.v. Κοχλίουσα*

Komba

town in Lycia: *Ptolemy* 5. 3. 5

Korydalla

town in Lycia: *Ptolemy* 5. 3. 6
mt. town in e. Lycia; grouped with Gagae and Rhodiapolis: *Pliny, nat.* 5. 28. 100.
Rhodian foundation: *Hekataios ap. Steph. Byz. s.v. Κορύδαλλα*

Korykos

tract of Lycian sea-coast: *Strabo* 14. 3. 8

Kragos mt.

mt. in Lycia, named after Kragos, son of Tremilos and the nymph Praxidike: *Ptolemy* 5. 3. 4, *Alex. Polyhist. ap. Steph. Byz. s.v. Κράγος*
promontory in Lycia: *Pliny, nat.* 5. 28. 100
has 8 promontories and city of same name; scene of Chimaera myth: *Strabo* 14. 3. 5
ref. in Pomponius Mela, *chor.* 1. 15. 82
haunt of wild beasts and brigands: *Euripides, Sthen., Nauck*² *frag.* 669
associated with Leto: *Horace, carm.* 1. 21. 5-8
on route of Byblis in her wanderings through Lycia: *Ovid, met.* 9. 646

Kyaneae

town in Lycia: *Pliny, nat.* 5. 28. 101.
oracular seat of Apollo Thyrsos: *Pausanias* 7. 21. 13

Kydna

town in Lycia: *Ptolemy* 5. 3. 5

Letoon

likely site of Leto's encounter with the herdsmen on her arrival in Lycia: *Antoninus Liberalis, met.* 35, *Ovid, met.* 6. 317-81
sanctuary of Leto; 10 stades along Xanthos river, 60 stades (sic) from Xanthos city: *Strabo* 14. 2. 2., 14. 3. 6
Mithridates deterred by dream from cutting down trees there: *Appian, Mith.* 12. 4. 27
likely site of bronze tablet allegedly foretelling destruction of the Persian empire: *Plutarch, Alex.* 17. 4

Lycia (general)

A. *Historical references* (in chronological order)
Rhodian expedition against Lycia, led by Kleoboulos: Timachidas, Lind. Chron. C XXIII (citing Timokritos and Polyzelos)
Lycia and Cilicia unsubdued by Kroisos: *Herodotos* 1. 28
conquest by Harpagos: *Herodotos* 1. 176
included in first Persian nomos: *Herodotos* 1. 173
tradition of Lycian participation in the Persian conquest of Sardis: *Strabo* 13. 4. 8
contribution to Xerxes' fleet - 50 ships: *Herodotos* 7. 92; 40 ships: *Diodoros* 11. 3. 7
Kimon wins over the Lycians 'by persuasion': *Diodoros* 11. 60. 5
Melesander's expedition into Lycia: *Thucydides* 2. 69
Lycian participation in the satrap rebellion: *Diodoros* 15. 90. 4
under control of Mausolos: *Lucian, dial. mort.* 24 (but see Houwink ten Cate, 1965, 13, n. 4), (pseudo-) Aristotle, *oecon.* 2. 2. 14 (=1348a)
conquest by Alexander: *Arrian, anab.* 1. 14. 3-6
assigned by Alexander to Nearchos as part of his satrapy: *Arrian* 3. 6. 6, *Justin, hist. phil.* 13. 4. 15
under control of satrap Antigonos after Alexander's death: *Diodoros* 18. 3. 1, 18. 39. 6, *Quintus Curtius* 10. 10, *Appian, Syr.* 11. 9. 53
Lycian contingent in army of Antigonos: *Diodoros* 19. 29. 3, 19. 69. 1, 19. 82. 4
under Ptolemaic control: *Theokritos, id.* 17. 89, *Livy* 33. 19. 11
attempt by Antiochos III to win over the whole shore of Cilicia, Lycia, and Caria (197 B.C.): *Livy* 33. 19. 11, *Hieronymus, comm. in Daniel*, 11. 15
Lycian participation in the battle of Sipylos (190 B.C.): *Livy* 37. 40. 14, *Appian, Syr.* 11. 6. 32
Lycia's fierce but unsuccessful resistance to Roman forces under Livius (at Phoenikos) in war with Antiochos (190 B.C.): *Livy* 37. 16. 8-12
Romans abandon campaign in Lycia: *Livy* 37. 16. 13-14, 37. 17. 1 assigned by Roman senate to Rhodes after battle of Magnesia, (189 B.C.): *Polybius* 21. 24. 7-8, 22. 5, 25. 4-5, *Livy* 37. 55. 5, 37. 56. 5, 38. 39. 13, *Appian, Syr.* 11. 7. 44
Lycian mercenaries secured for service of Eumenes: *Diodoros* 18. 61. 4-5
Lycia assigned to Eumenes: *Justin, hist. phil.* 13. 6. 14
Lycian envoys complain of harsh treatment by Rhodians (178 B.C.): *Livy* 41. 6. 8-12

- conflict between Lycians and Rhodians (174 B.C.): *Livy* 41. 25. 8
 Perseus accuses Eumenes (before Roman senate) of stirring the Lycians
 against the Rhodians: *Livy* 42. 14. 8
 Lycia granted independence of Rhodes by Roman senate (167 B.C.):
Polybius 30. 5. 12, 30. 31. 4-5. *Livy* 44. 15. 1, *Appian*,
Mith. 12. 9. 62
 the complaints and appeals of the Rhodians to the Roman senate
 regarding the loss of Lycia: *Polybius* 30. 31. 4-5, 31. 4. 1-3
 Lycians in Cicero's army during his governorship of Cilicia: *Cicero*,
Att. 6. 5
 Verres' dealings with Lycia: *Cicero*, *Verr.* 1. 38. 95
 Lycian territory converted into *ager publicus*: *Cicero*, *leg. agr.*
 1 *frag.* 3
 Lycia's opposition to Brutus and Cassius; Brutus' conquest of Lycia:
Plutarch, *Brut.* 30-32, *Appian*, *bell. civ.* 4. 8. 60-61, 4.
 9. 65, *Dio Cassius* 47. 33. 1-2, 47. 34. 1-6, 47. 36. 3-4
 Antony releases Lycia from taxes: *Appian*, *bell. civ.* 5. 1. 7
 Lycia becomes Roman province (43 A.D.): *Suetonius*, *Claud.* 25
 flood in Lycia during Nero's reign: *Dio Cassius* 63. 26. 5
 Vespasian re-establishes Lycia, along with Pamphylia, as a Roman
 province: *Suetonius*, *Vesp.* 8
 Lycia and Pamphylia still united in 313 A.D.: *cod Theod.* 13. 10. 2
 Lycian League - account of composition: *Strabo* 14. 3. 3
 Phaselis not a member of League: *Strabo* 14. 3. 9
 sends envoys to Brutus: *Appian*, *bell. civ.*
 4. 10. 82
- B *Geography, Vegetation, and Products*
 nature and extent of coastline - length, 1720 stades, well supplied with
 harbours: *Strabo* 14. 2. 1; voyage along coast takes 1 day + 1
 night (double this overland): *Skylax* 100
 interior rugged and hard to travel, separated from Kibyria by Taurus
 mts.: *Strabo* 14. 2. 1
 the heights of Lycia: *Quintus Smyrn.* 8. 84
 formerly contained 70 towns, now 36 (in 1st cent. A.D.): *Pliny*,
nat. 5. 28. 100
 earthquakes in Lycia followed by 40 days of fine weather: *Pliny*, *nat.*
 2. 97. 211
 specific earthquakes: *Pausanias* 2. 7. 1, 8. 43. 4
 cedar trees: *Theophrastos*, *hist. plant.* 3. 12. 3, *Pliny*, *nat.*
 12. 61. 132, 13. 11. 52, 16. 59. 137
 cypress trees: *Theophrastos*, *hist. plant.* 4. 5. 2.
 plane trees: *Pliny*, *nat.* 12. 5. 9
- lycium* (boxthorn juice) used for medicinal purposes: *Celsus*, *med.*
 5. 26. 30, 6. 7. 2, 8. 6. 2, *Dioscorides*, *mat. med.* 1. 100,
Pliny, *nat.* 24. 76. 124, 24. 77. 125-26, 25. 30. 67
 sponges (from Antiphellos): *Pliny*, *nat.* 9. 69. 149, 31. 47. 131
 saffron (from Mt. Olympos): *Pliny*, *nat.* 21. 17. 31 & 33
 attar of roses (from Phaselis): *Pliny*, *nat.* 13. 2. 5, *Athenaeus*,
deip. 15. 688E (citing *Apollonius Mys*)
 lilies (of Phaselis): *Pliny*, *nat.* 21. 11. 24
 fine quality of Lycian hams: *Athenaeus*, *deip.* 14. 657E (citing
Strabo)

- wine (from Telmessos): *Pliny*, *nat.* 14. 9. 74
 goat's fleece (used in rope-making): *Aristotle*, *hist. an.* 8. 28
 (= 605b), *Aelian*, *nat. an.* 16. 30 (citing *Kallisthenes*)
 gilded sandals (from Patara): *Lucian*, *dial. mer.* 14. 2 & 3
 jet (*Gagates lapis*)^{*} (from Gagae): *Pliny*, *nat.* 35. 57. 196
^{*}according to Bean, the ancient authors speak of it more often as a
 combustible substance resembling lignite (1978, 149)
- Limyra**
 river and town in Lycia: *Skylax*, 100. *Pliny*, *nat.* 5. 28. 100,
Pomponius Mela, *chor.* 1. 15. 82, *Ptolemy* 5. 3. 6
 small in size; 20 stades inland: *Strabo* 14. 3. 7
 adjacent to territory of Arykanda: *Athenaeus*, *deip.* 12. 527F
 (citing *Agatharchides*)
 captured by Antiochos III in conquest of Lycia: *Hieronymus*,
comm. in Daniel 11. 15
 site of death of Gaius Caesar: *Dio Cassius* 55. 10. 9
 fish divination: *Pliny*, *nat.* 31. 18. 22
 on route of Byblis in her wanderings through Lycia: *Ovid*, *met.*
 9. 646
- Limyros r.**
 river on which Limyra stands: *Strabo* 14. 3. 7, *Pomponius Mela*,
chor. 1. 15. 82; *Pliny*, *nat.* 5. 28. 100, *Ptolemy* 5. 3. 3
 location of residence of Chlemos, Lycian warrior at Troy,
 comrade and successor of Glaukos: *Quintus Smyrn.* 8. 103
- Lyrnatia**
 peninsula and fortress in Lycia: *Skylax* 100, *Alex. Polyhist.*
ap. Steph. Byz. s.v. Λυρνάτια
- Makra**
 island off Lycian coast: *Alex. Polyhist.* *ap. Steph. Byz.*
s.v. Μάκρα
- Massicytus range**
 mt. range in Lycia: *Pliny*, *nat.* 5. 28. 100, *Ptolemy* 5. 3. 1 & 6,
Quintus Smyrn. 3. 234, 8. 107
- Megiste** (see also *Kisthene*)
 town and island in Lycia: *Alex. Polyhist.* *ap. Steph. Byz.*
s.v. Μεγίστη *Strabo* 14. 3. 7, *Ptolemy* 5. 3. 9
 in possession of Rhodes: *Skylax* 100
 its harbour the meeting place of the Rhodian fleet (190 B.C.): *Livy*
 37. 22. 5, 37. 24. 12, 37. 45. 2
- Melaenae**
 town in Lycia: *Alex. Polyhist.* *ap. Steph. Byz.*
s.v. Μέλαιναί
- Melite**
 spring in Lycia (at Letoon?), associated with Leto's arrival in Lycia:
Antoninus Liberalis, *met.* 35. 2 (called Melas by *Probus*,
Verg. Georg. 1. 378)

Milyas

region adjacent to Kibyra: *Strabo* 13. 4. 17, *Ptolemy* 5. 3. 7
 original name of Lycia, inhabited by the Solymians before arrival of
 Sarpedon and Termilae: *Herodotos* 1. 173, *Strabo* 12. 8. 5,
 14. 3. 10, *Timagenes* app. *Steph. Byz.* s.v. Μιλύα
 war equipment of Milyans: *Herodotos* 7. 77
 part of Lycia at time of Alexander's conquests; later part of Phrygia:
Arrian, *anab.* 1. 24. 5
 captured from Eumenes by Prusias and restored to Eumenes by Romans
 (189 B.C.): *Polybius* 21. 45. 10, *Livy* 37. 56. 2, 38. 39. 16
 distinguished from Lycia in Roman period: *Cicero*, *Verr.* 1. 38. 95,
Strabo 14. 5. 7
 city in Milyas called 'the city of Cretans': *Polybius* 5. 72. 5

Molyndeia

town in Lycia: *Alex. Polyhist.* app. *Steph. Byz.*
 s.v. Μολύνδεια

Myra

town in Lycia: *Pliny*, *nat.* 5. 28. 100, *Ptolemy* 5. 3. 6
 located on hill 20 stades above the sea: *Strabo* 14. 3. 7
 fish divination: *Pliny*, *nat.* 32. 8. 17
 one of six largest cities of the League: *Artemidoros* ap.
Strabo 14. 3. 7
 surrenders to Brutus in civil war: *Appian*, *bell. civ.* 4. 10. 82,
Dio Cassius 47. 34. 6

Ninos r.

river in Lycia; scene of death of Daedalos: *Alex. Polyhist.* ap.
Steph. Byz. s.v. Ναιδαλα

Noscopium

town in Lycia: *Pliny*, *nat.* 5. 28. 101 (but see Robert, 1962,
 161-69)

Oinoanda

town in Lycia: *Alex. Polyhist.* ap. *Steph. Byz.*
 s.v. Οἰνόανδα
 part of district of Kabalia: *Pliny*, *nat.* 5. 28. 101, *Ptolemy*
 5. 3. 8
 part of district of Kibyra: *Strabo* 13. 4. 17
 supported Brutus in siege of Xanthos: *Appian*, *bell. civ.*
 4. 10. 79

Oktapolis

town in Lycia: *Ptolemy* 5. 3. 5

Olbia

town in Lycia: *Skylax* 100, *Strabo* 14. 3. 8

Olympos

town and mt. in Lycia (mt. alternatively called
 Phoenikos): *Strabo* 14. 3. 8

commanding view of Lycia, Pamphylia, Pisidia, and Milyas:
Strabo 14. 5. 7

in vicinity of Mt. Chimaera: *Pliny*, *nat.* 5. 28. 100

one of six largest cities of League: *Artemidoros* ap. *Strabo*
 14. 3. 3

stronghold of Cilician pirate Zeniketes; captured by
 P. Servilius Isauricus: *Strabo* 14. 5. 7, *Florus* 1. 41,
Eutropius 6. 3

territory converted into *ager publicus* (1st cent. B.C.): *Cicero*,
leg. agr. 2. 50

decline of city to mere fortress in 3rd cent. A.D.: *Solinus* 39. 2

Patara (see also Arsinoe)

town in Lycia: *Skylax* 100, *Ptolemy* 5. 3. 3, *Hesychios*
 s.v. Πατάρα(η)ς

named after Pataros, son of Apollo and nymph Lycia:

Alex. Polyhist. ap. *Steph. Byz.* s.v. Πάταρα

founded by Lycadius, son of Apollo and Lycia: *Servius*, *Verg.*
Aen. 3. 332

formerly called Pataros: *Pliny*, *nat.* 5. 28. 100

residence of Apollo for the 6 winter months: *Vergil*, *Aen.*

4. 143-44, *Servius*, *Verg. Aen.* 4. 143-44

Apollo associated equally with Delos and Patara: *Horace*,
carm. 3. 4. 61-64

harbour, temple of Apollo, founded by Pataros; town renamed
 Arsinoe by Ptolemy Philadelphos: *Strabo* 14. 3. 6

bronze bowl made by Hephaestus dedicated by Telephos in

Apollo's temple: *Pausanias* 9. 41. 1

statues of Apollo and Zeus at Patara, allegedly by Pheidias:

Clement, *protr.* 41

the oracle: *Herodotos* 1. 182, *Vergil*, *Aen.* 4. 143-44, 4.

346, 4. 377, *Pomponius Mela*, *chor.* 1. 15. 82, *Statius*,

Theb. 8. 200, *Oracula Sibyllina* 3. 441

surrender to Alexander: *Arrian*, *anab.* 1. 24. 4, *Aelian*, *var.*

1. 25. 11-12

besieged by Mithridates: *Appian*, *Mith.* 12. 4. 27

naval base of Antigonos: *Diodoros* 19. 64. 5

under control of Demetrios, son of Antigonos (315 B.C.):

Diodoros 20. 93. 3

captured by Antiochos III (197 B.C.): *Hieronymus*, *comm.*

in *Daniel* 11.15

under control of Antiochos (196 B.C.): *Livy* 33. 41. 5

role in Rome's war with Antiochos: *Livy* 37. 15. 6-8, 37.

16. 1-5, 37. 17. 10, 37. 24. 11-13, 37. 45. 2, 38. 39. 2-3

one of six largest cities of League: *Artemidoros* ap. *Strabo*

14. 3. 3

surrenders to Brutus: *Plutarch*, *Brut.* 32, *Appian* *bell. civ.*

4. 10. 81-82, *Dio Cassius* 47. 34. 4-6

marriage ties with Xanthos: *Dio Cassius* 47. 34. 4

gilded sandals from Patara: *Lucian*, *dial. mer.* 14. 2 & 3

Peirana

town in Lycia, home of Bellerophon: *Pindar*, *Ol.*

13. 66-67

Peraea

beginning of the western seaboard: *Strabo* 14. 2. 1-2
 beginning of Taurus range: *Strabo* 14. 3. 8
 bordered on territory of Kibyra: *Strabo* 13. 4. 17
 contained several fortresses, including Daedala:
Livy 37. 22. 3
 dispute between Rhodians and Bumenes over forts and
 territory on borders of Rhodian Peraea: *Polybius* 27. 7. 6

Phaselis

town assigned to Pamphylia: *Stratonikos* ap. *Athenaios*,
deip. 8. 349F, *Lucan*, *bell. civ.* 8. 249-54, *Pliny*, *nat.* 5.
 26. 96, *Pomponius Mela*, *chor.* 1. 14. 79, *Eusebius*, *chron.*
ed. Schöne 2. 84f.
 assigned to Lycia: *Skylax* 100, *Strabo* 14. 3. 9,
Ptolemy 5. 3. 3
 region in which Mt. Chimaera located: *Pliny*, *nat.*
 2. 110. 236
 founded by Mopsos: *Pomponius Mela*, *chor.* 1. 14. 79
 founded by Lakios; annual sacrifice of smoked fish to
Kylabras: *Heropythos* ap. *Philostephanos* ap. *Athenaios*,
deip. 7. 297-98, *Zenobius*, *cent.* 6. 36
 Dorian in origin: *Herodotos* 2. 178
 three harbours; nearby, the passes through which Alexander
 led his troops: *Strabo* 14. 3. 9
 strategic location, unhealthy climate: *Livy* 37. 23. 1-2
 besieged and captured by Kimon: *Plutarch*, *Kim.* 12. 3-4
 established as limit of Persian territory after battle of
 Eurymedon: *Diodoros* 12. 4. 5
 base for merchant ships in Peloponnesian War: *Thucydides*
 2. 69
 blockade of harbour by Lycian Perikle: *Polyaenus*,
strat. 5. 42
 voluntary submission to Alexander; attacks on Phaselitan
 farmers by Pisidians: *Arrian*, *anab.* 1. 24. 5-6
 captured by Ptolemy I Soter: *Diodoros* 20. 27. 1
 captured by Antiochos III: *Hieronymus*, *comm. in*
Daniel 11. 15
 Rhodian fleet bypasses city to avoid disease during war with
 Antiochos: *Livy* 37. 23. 1-2
 Polyaratos' unsuccessful attempt to gain sanctuary in Phaselis
 (during 3rd Macedonian War): *Polybius* 30. 9. 1-12
 not a member of Lycian League: *Strabo* 14. 3. 9
 partnered with Cilician pirates: *Strabo* 14. 5. 7, *Cicero*, *Verr.*
 4. 10. 21
 captured by P. Servilius Isauricus: *Florus* 1. 41. 5,
Eutropius 6. 3
 occupied by Pompey; greatly reduced population then: *Lucan*,
bell. civ. 8. 249-54.
 territory of Phaselis and Olympos converted into *ager*
publicus: *Cicero*, *leg. agr.* 2. 50
 unsavoury character of Phaselitans: *Stratonikos* ap.
Athenaeus, *deip.* 8. 349F, *Demosthenes*, 35. 1-5, *Cicero*,
Verr. 4. 10. 23

trafficking in offices: *Makarios* 8. 26
 inhabited by Lycians, 'a Greek people': *Cicero*, *Verr.*
 4. 10. 21
 inhabitants driven from city by wasps: *Aelian*, *nat.*
an. 11. 28
 the lilies of Phaselis: *Pliny*, *nat.* 21. 11. 24
 attar of roses produced at Phaselis: *Apollonius Mys* ap.
Athenaeus, *deip.* 15. 688E, *Pliny*, *nat.* 13. 2. 5
 ref. to bronze spear of Achilles in temple of Athene at Phaselis:
Pausanias 3. 3. 8

Phellos

town in Lycia: *Skylax* 100, *Alex. Polyhist.* ap. *Steph. Byz.*
s.v. φέλλος *Strabo* 14. 3. 7, *Pliny*, *nat.* 5. 28. 100,
Ptolemy 5. 3. 6

Phoenike

town and river in Lycia: *Quintus Smyrn.* 8. 106, Constantine
Porphyry, *them.* 1. 14
 destination of Roman-Rhodian fleet (190 B.C.); description of
 harbour; Lycians' unsuccessful resistance to Roman commander
 Livius there: *Livy* 37. 16. 8-12

Phoenikos mt.

alternative name of Mt. Olympos: *Strabo* 14. 3. 8

Pinara

town in Lycia: *Pliny*, *nat.* 5. 28. 101, *Ptolemy* 5. 3. 5
 one of six largest cities of League: *Artemidoros* ap.
Strabo 14. 3. 3
 at foot of Mt. Kragos; Pandaros honoured there: *Strabo*
 14. 3. 5
 colonised by elders from Xanthos; established on round peak,
 and hence the name Pinara (Lycian for 'round'): *Menekrates* ap.
Steph. Byz. *s.v.* 'Ἀρτύμνησος
 surrenders to Alexander: *Arrian*, *anab.* 1. 24. 4

Podalia

town in Lycia, belonging to Milyas district: *Pliny*, *nat.*
 5. 28. 101, *Ptolemy* 5. 3. 7

Pyrrha

town in Lycia: *Pliny*, *nat.* 5. 28. 101

Rhodia

town in Lycia: *Ptolemy* 5. 3. 6

Rhodiapolis

mt. town in Lycia, grouped with Gagae and Korydalla: *Pliny*,
nat. 5. 28. 101.
 named after Rhode, daughter of Mopsos: *Theopompos* ap.
Photius, *bib.* 176, p. 129a 14. 15 (*Jac. IIB* 115 no. 103)

Sarpedonion

temple in Xanthos at time of Brutus' siege: *Appian, bell. civ. 4. 10. 78-71*

Sebeda

harbour in Lycia: *Alex. Polyhist. ap. Steph. Byz. s.v. Σέβεδα*

Sibros/Sirbis r.

alternative name of the Xanthos r.: *Panyasis ap. Steph. Byz. s.v. Τρεμύλη Strabo 14. 3. 6*

Sidyma

town in Lycia: *Alex. Polyhist. ap. Steph. Byz. s.v. Σίδυμα Pliny, nat. 5. 28. 100, Ptolemy 5. 3. 5*

Simena

town in Lycia: *Pliny, nat. 5. 28. 100*

Sura

fish divination, shrine of Apollo: *Polycharmos and Artemidoros ap. Athenaeus, deip. 8. 333D-E, Aelian, nat. an. 8. 5, 12. 1, Plutarch, sol. an. 976C*

Symbra

town in Lycia: *Ptolemy 5. 3. 5*

Taurus range

in relation to Lycia: *Strabo 14. 2. 1, Pliny, nat. 5. 27. 97*, begins in Caria and Lycia, in Rhodian Peraea (not as most writers say in Chelidonian islands): *Strabo 11. 12. 2, 14. 2. 1, 14. 3. 8* peaks around Lycia occupied by Solymians: *Strabo 1. 2. 10*

Telandros

town and promontory in Caria: *Alex. Polyhist. ap. Steph. Byz. s.v. Τήλανδρος*

town in Lycia: *Pliny, nat. 5. 28. 101*

mountain, location of burial of Glaukos: *Quintus Smyrn. 4. 7-9*

Telmessus

promontory with harbour in Lycia; received by Eumenes from Romans during war with Antiochos; recovered by Lycians after dissolution of Eumenes' kingdom: *Strabo 14. 3. 4*

Telmessos

town in Lycia near Carian border: *Skylax 100, Pliny, nat. 5. 28. 101, Pomponius Mela, chor. 1. 15. 82, Ptolemy 5. 3. 2* conquered by Lycian Perikle: *Theopompus ap. Photius, bib. 176, p. 120a 14. 17 (Jac. IIB 115 no. 103)* surrenders to Alexander: *Arrian, anab. 1. 24. 4* Roman naval action against Antiochos in gulf of Telmessos; destruction of 50 of Antiochos' ships anchored there: *Livy 37. 16. 13, 38. 39. 3*

transferred by Romans from Ptolemy of Telmessos to

Eumenes (189 B.C.): *Livy 37. 56. 4*

reassigned by Roman senate to Eumenes after taken from him by Prusias: *Polybius 21. 45. 10*

separate from Lycia at time of Mithridatic war (early 1st cent. B.C.): *Appian, Mith. 12. 4. 24*

prophets consulted by Gordios: *Arrian, anab. 2. 3. 3*

prophets (priests of Apollo) consulted by Kroisos and Meles:

Herodotos 1. 78 and 1. 84 (respectively)

described as *urbs religiosissima*: *Pliny, nat. 30. 2. 6* noted for wine: *Pliny, nat. 14. 9. 74*

Tlos

town in Lycia: *Pliny, nat. 5. 28. 101, Ptolemy 5. 3. 5* near pass giving access to Kibyra; one of six largest cities of the League: *Artemidoros ap. Strabo 14. 3. 3* site of Bellerophon's tomb: *Quintus Smyrn. 10. 162-63*

Trebendai

town in Lycia: *Ptolemy 5. 3. 6*

Xanthos

town in Lycia: *Skylax 100, Pliny, nat. 5. 28. 100, Pomponius Mela, chor. 1. 15. 82, Ptolemy 5. 3. 5*

15 (Roman) miles from the sea: *Pliny, nat. 5. 28. 100*

largest city in Lycia: *Strabo 14. 3. 6*

one of six largest cities of League: *Artemidoros ap. Strabo 14. 3. 3*

conquered by Harpagos: *Herodotos 1. 176, Appian, bell. civ. 4. 10. 80*

foreign elements in population following Harpagos' conquest: *Herodotos 1. 176*

surrenders to Alexander: *Arrian, anab. 1. 24. 4*

alleged destruction by Alexander: *Appian, bell. civ. 4. 10. 80* captured by Ptolemy I Soter from Antigonos: *Diodoros 20. 27. 1*

siege and destruction by Brutus: *Appian, bell. civ. 4. 10.*

76-80, Dio Cassius 47. 34. 1-3, Plutarch, Brut. 30-31

Antony urges rebuilding of city: *Appian, bell. civ. 5. 1. 7*

marriage ties with Patara: *Dio Cassius 47. 34. 4*

school of grammaticians there in late antiquity: *Marinos, vita Procli 6-8*

Xanthos r.

river in Lycia: *Skylax, 100, Pliny, nat. 5. 28. 100,*

Pomponius Mela, chor. 1. 15. 82, Ptolemy 5. 3. 2

originally called the Sibros/Sirbis: *Strabo 14. 3. 6*

created by birth pangs of Leto: *Quintus Smyrn. 11. 22-26*

divine name for Scamander r. in Troad: *Homer, Il. 20. 73-74*

named in Sarpedon's kingdom: *Homer, Il. 5. 479, 12. 313-14*

associated with Leto's arrival in Lycia: *Antoninus Liberalis, met. 35.1*

temple of Apollo founded by Telchines beside river: *Diodoros 5. 56. 1*

on route of Byblis in her journey through Lycia: *Ovid, met.*

9. 646

referred to in poetic imagery: *Alkman, l. 100-01*

(*Lycian Xanthos?*)

site of battle between Lycians and Greeks: *Menander,*

Asp. 23-114

Zeleaia

homeland of the contingent led by Pandaros in the Trojan

War: *Homer, Il. 2. 824-27, 4. 121, Strabo 12. 4. 6, 13. 1.*

7

Lycian colony near Zeleaia: *Plutarch, mul. virt. 247F*

REGISTER III - PERSONAL NAMES

(A list of the names of persons and deities associated with Lycia in the Greek and Roman literary sources. Multiple references are given in chronological order.)

Alexander

conquest of Lycia (334-33 B.C.): *Plutarch, Alex. 17, Arrian, anab. 1. 24. 4-6*

alleged destruction of Xanthos: *Appian, bell. civ. 4. 10. 80*

uses Patara as one of his emporia: *Aelian, var. 1. 25. 11-12*

supported by Lycian fleet in war with Dareios: *Arrian,*

anab. 2. 20. 2

appoints Nearchos satrap of Lycia and neighbouring territories:

Arrian, anab. 3. 6. 6, Justin, hist. phil. 13. 4. 15

siege of Marmares (near Lycia): *Diodoros 17. 28. 1*

discovery of bronze tablet (at the Letoon?) foretelling

destruction of Persian empire: *Plutarch, Alex. 17. 4-5*

march from Lycia to Pamphylia: *Strabo 14. 3. 9*

uses a Lycian as interpreter/guide in Persia: *Diodoros*

17. 68. 4-7, Curtius 5. 4. 10-13, Plutarch, Alex. 37. 1-2,

Arrian, anab. 4. 3. 7

Amazons

conflicts in western Asia Minor: *Strabo 12. 8. 6*

conflict with Bellerophon: *Homer, Il. 6. 186, Pindar,*

Ol. 13. 87-88, Plutarch, mul. virt. 248A

Amisodaros (Isaras)

from Lycian colony near Zeleaia; voyage to Lycia with

pirate fleet: *Plutarch, mul. virt. 247F*

breeds the Chimaera: *Homer, Il. 16. 328. Apollodoros,*

bib. 2. 3. 1

Amphianax

alternative name of Iobates (s.v.)

Anteia

alternative name of Stheneboea, (s.v.)

Antigonos

satrap of Lycia, Phrygia, and Pamphylia after Alexander's

death (in settlement of 321 B.C.): *Diodoros 18. 3. 1, Quintus*

Curtius 10. 10, Appian, Syr. 11. 9. 53

Lycian contingents in army of Antigonos: *Diodoros*

19. 29. 3, 19. 69. 1, 19. 82. 4

uses Patara as a naval base: *Diodoros 19. 64. 5*

Antikleia

alternative name of Philonoe (s.v.)

Apollo

birth in plain of Xanthos: *Quintus Smyrn. 11. 22-26*

arrival in Lycia as infant: *Antoninus Liberalis, met. 35*

father of Lycadius, founder of Patara: *Servius, Verg.*

Aen. 3. 332.

father of Pataros: *Steph. Byz. s.v. Παταρα*
 Lykios - epithet applied to Apollo: *Servius, Verg. Aen. 4. 377, Macrobius, sat. 1. 17. 36*
 Lykegenes - epithet applied to Apollo: *Homer, Il. 4. 101*
 identified as 'wolf-slayer': *Sophokles, El. 7-8*
 Apollo Loxias, 'lord of the Lycians': *Bacchylides 12. 147-48*
 associated with Lycia: *Sophokles, Oed. 205-07*
 associated with Pandaros in Trojan War: *Homer, Il. 2. 827*
 associated with Glaukos in Trojan War: *Homer, Il. 16. 513-31, Quintus Smyrn. 4. 4-6*
 prepares Sarpedon's corpse for burial: *Homer, Il. 16. 666-83*
 orders the Lycians to worship Skylakeus as a god: *Quintus Smyrn. 10. 164-66*
 oracular seat at Sura: *Polycharmos, ap. Athenaeos, deip. 8. 333, Aelian, nat. an. 12. 1*
 oracular seat of Apollo Thyrxeus at Kyaneae: *Pausanias 7. 21. 13*
 oracular seat at Patara: *Strabo 14. 3. 6, Pomponius Mela chor. 1. 15. 82, Statius, Theb. 8. 200*
 bronze bowl dedicated by Telephus in temple at Patara: *Pausanias 9. 41. 1*
 statues of Zeus and Apollo at Patara: *Clement, protr. 41*
 spends six winter months at Patara: *Vergil, Aen. 4. 143-44*
 associated equally with Delos and Patara: *Horace, carm. 3. 4. 61-64*
 temple founded by Telchines beside Xanthos river: *Diodoros 5. 56. 1*

Aristander

seer of Telmessos, consulted by Alexander: *Arrian, anab. 1. 25. 8, 4. 3. 7, 4. 4. 3*

Artemis

arrival in Lycia as infant: *Antoninus Liberalis, met. 35*
 birth on plain of Xanthos: *Quintus Smyrn. 11. 22-26*
 associated with Lycia: *Sophokles, Oed. 208*

Asteropaios

chosen by Sarpedon as his comrade in arms (along with Glaukos) at Troy: *Homer, Il. 12. 101-04*

Athene

tames and presents Pegasos to Bellerophon: *Pausanias 2. 4. 1*
 bronze spear of Achilles in temple of Athene at Phaselis: *Pausanias 3. 3. 8*

Bellerophon

the legend of Bellerophon, incl. his journey to & exploits in Lycia: *Homer, Il. 6. 155-97, Hesiod, Theog. 319.25, Pindar, Isthm. 7. 44-47, Ol. 13. 60-92, Euripides, Sthen.*

Nauck², frags. 660-72, Diodoros 6. 9. 1, Strabo 12. 8. 5-6, Pliny, nat. 13. 27. 88, Apollodoros, bib. 2. 3. 1-2, Plutarch, mul. virt. 248A-D, Hyginus, fab. 57, Zenobius, cent. 2.87, Pausanias 2. 4. 2, Athenaeus, deip. 5. 185, Servius, Verg. Aen. 6. 288

father of Deidameia who married Euandros, son of Sarpedon (I) and became father of Sarpedon (II): *Diodoros 5. 79. 3*
 ancestor of Lycian Leukippos who founded Cretinaeum in district near Ephesos: *Parthenius, erot. 5*
 credited with name change from Tremile to Lycia: *Alex Polyhist. ap Steph. Byz. s.v.*
 tomb in Tlos: *Quintus Smyrn. 10. 162-63*

Brutus

conquests in Lycia: *Plutarch, Brut. 30-32, Appian, bell. civ. 4. 10. 76-82, Dio Cassius 47. 34. 1-6*

Casandra

alternative name of Philonoe (s.v.): *Schol Homer, Il. 6. 155.*

Chimaera

bred by Amisodaros: *Homer, Il. 16. 328, Apollodoros, bib. 2. 3. 1*
 description: *Homer, Il. 6. 181-82, Ovid, met. 9. 647-48, Hyginus, fab. 57, Servius, ad Verg. Aen. 6. 288*
 conflict with Bellerophon: *Homer, Il. 6. 183, Hesiod, theog. 319-25, Pindar, Ol. 13. 90, Diodoros 6. 9. 1, Hyginus, fab. 57*
 suggested explanations of the myth: *Plutarch, mul. virt. 247F-248D*
 gen. association with Lycia: *Ovid, met. 6. 339, Pomponius Mela, chor. 1. 15. 80*
 myth located in the Kragos district: *Strabo 14. 3. 5*
 ref. to the ῥωχμός of Chimaera: *Quintus Smyrn. 8. 107*

Chimarrhus

pirate chief from Lycian colony near Zeleia; slain by Bellerophon: *Plutarch, mul. virt. 247F*

Chlemos

son of Peisenor, companion of Glaukos, assumed kingship of Lycia after Glaukos' death, resided on Limyros r., killed in Trojan War: *Quintus Smyrn. 8. 101-05*

Cyclopes

7 in number, Lycian in origin: *Strabo 8. 6. 11*
 built the walls of Tiryns for Proitos: *Bacchylides, 10. 77-78, Apollodoros, bib. 2. 2. 1, Pausanias 2. 25. 8*

Daedalos

died from tortoise bite while crossing the Ninos r. (in Lycia); city of Daedala founded on the site: *Alex. Polyhist. ap. Steph. Byz. s.v. Δαίδαλα*

Epikles

companion of Sarpedon at Troy; slain by Aias, son of Telamon:
Homer, Il. 12. 378-86

Eumenes

Lycian mercenaries secured for service of Eumenes: *Diodoros 18. 61. 4-5*

Lycia (along with Paphlagonia, Caria, and Phrygia) assigned to Eumenes: *Justin, hist. phil. 13. 6. 4*

Europa

abduction by Jupiter; mother of Sarpedon: *Hyginus, fab. 178. 1*

travels from Phoenicia to Crete, and thence to Lycia:
Herodotos 4. 45

Glaukos (son of Hippolochos)

role in the Trojan War: *Homer, Il. 2. 876-77, 6. 119-236, 7. 13-16, 12. 101-04, 12. 310-471, 16. 492-501, 513-665, 17. 140-68, Apollodoros, epit. 3. 35, Quintus Smyrn. 3. 214-85, 8. 105*

descendant of Bellerophon: *Pindar, Ol. 60-62*

burial beneath Mt. Telandros: *Quintus Smyrn. 4. 1-12*

Lycian descendants of Glaukos chosen as kings by Ionians:
Herodotos 1. 147

Glaukos (father of Bellerophon)

father of Bellerophon and son of Sisyphe: *Homer, Il. 6. 155, Apollodoros, bib. 2. 3. 1-2, Pausanias 2. 4. 2*

Harpagos

expedition into s.w. Asia Minor: *Herodotos 1. 171*
conquest of Xanthos: *Herodotos 1. 176, Appian, bell. civ. 4. 10. 80*

Hippolochos

father of Glaukos: *Homer, Il. 6. 206, Apollodoros, epit. 3. 35*

son of Bellerophon: *Homer, Il. 6. 196-97*

Iobates

Lycian king, alternatively named Amphianax, father-in-law of Argive king Proitos; provides Proitos with Lycian army for his return to Greece and occupation of Tiryns: *Bacchylides, 10. 77-84, Strabo 8. 6. 11, Apollodoros, bib. 2. 2. 1, Pausanias 2. 25. 8*

Isander (= Peisander: Strabo 12. 8. 5)

son of Bellerophon: *Homer, Il. 6. 196-97, Strabo 12. 8. 5*
slain by Ares in battle with Solymians: *Homer, Il. 203-04*
tomb near Telmessos: *Strabo 13. 4. 16*

Isaras

alternative name of Amisodaros (s.v.)

Isauricus, P. Servilius

conquest of pirate strongholds in and near Lycia: *Strabo 14. 3. 3 & 5, Florus 1. 41. 5, Eutropius 6. 3*

Kimon

wins over Lycians 'by persuasion': *Diodoros 11. 60. 5*
siege of Phaselis: *Plutarch, Kim. 12. 3-4*

Kragos

son of Tremilos and Praxidike, brother of Tloos, Xanthos, and Pinaros: *Panyasis ap. Steph. Byz. s.v. Τρεμίλης*
2nd husband of Milye: *Steph. Byz. s.v. Μιλύα*

Kybernis (= Lyc. Kuprili?)

son of Kossika; commander of Lycian naval contingent in Xerxes' invasion of Greece: *Herodotos 7. 98*

Kylabras

hero honoured by Phaselitans with offering of pickled fish:
Zenobius cent. 6. 36
sold site of Phaselis to Lakios for smoked fish: *Athenaeus, deip. 7. 297E-98A, citing Heropythos and Philostephanos*

Lakios

founder of Phaselis: *Timachidas, Lind. Chron. c XXIV*
purchased site from Kylabras with smoked fish: see under *Kylabras*

Lakritos

Phaselitan involved in lawsuit: *Demosthenes 35*

Laodamas

Lycian slain by Neoptolemos in Trojan War: *Quintus Smyrn. 11. 20-21*

Laodameia

daughter of Bellerophon; mother of Sarpedon: *Homer, Il. 6. 196-99*
slain by Artemis: *Homer, Il. 6. 205*

Leto

arrival in Lycia: *Ovid, met. 6. 317-81, Antonius Liberalis, met. 35, Servius, Verg. Georg. 1. 378*
gives birth to Apollo and Artemis in Lycia; creates Xanthos river in her birth pangs: *Quintus Smyrn. 11. 22-26*

Leukippos

Ionian king of Asia Minor; traces his ancestry to Glaukos, son of Bellerophon: *Herodotos 1. 147*
son of Xanthios, descendant of Bellerophon; flight to Crete, and return to Asia Minor where he founded Cretinaeum: *Parthenius, erot. 5*

Lycadius

son of Apollo and nymph Lycia; founder of Patara: *Servius*,
Verg. Aen. 331. 19-25

Lykos

son of Pandion, refugee from Athens to Lycia: *Herodotos* 1.
173, 7. 92, *Strabo* 12. 8. 5, 14. 3. 10, *Pomponius Mela*,
chor. 1. 14. 79, *Pausanias* 1. 19. 3
one of Telchines who went to Lycia; founded temple of Apollo by
Xanthos r.: *Diodoros* 5. 56. 1

Mausolos

ruler of part of Lycia (or Lydia?, see Houwink ten Cate, 1965,
13, n. 4): *Lucian*, *dial. mort.* 24
demands Lycians' long hair for his horses' forelocks: (pseudo-)
Aristotle, *oecon.* 1348a. 29-34

Melesander

campaign and death in Lycia: *Thucydides* 2. 69

Miletos

refugee from crete, founder of town Miletos in Asia Minor:
Ovid, *met.* 9. 446-48, *Apollodoros*, *bib.* 3. 1. 2

Milye

sister and wife of Solymos; subsequently wife of Kragos:
Steph. Byz. s.v. Μιλύει

Mithridates

conquest of Lycia: *Appian*, *Mith.* 12. 3. 20-21
siege of Patara: *Appian*, *Mith.* 12. 4. 27
Lycia liberated from Mithridates by Sulla: *Appian*, *Mith.* 12.
9. 61

Mopsos

founder of Phaselis: *Pomponius Mela*, *chor.* 1. 14. 79
father of Rhode (s.v.): *Theopompos* 12 ap. *Photius*, *bib.* 176 p.
120a 14. 15, (*Jac. II B* 115, no. 113)
instigated foundation of Phaselis by Lakios: *Athenaeos*, *deip.*
297E-98A

Naucrates

Lycian leader in the unsuccessful resistance against Brutus:
Plutarch, *Brut.* 30. 3

Nearchos

appointed satrap of Lycia and neighbouring territories by
Alexander: *Arrian* 3. 6. 6, *Justin*, *hist. phil.* 13. 4. 15

Nemios

Rhodian commander; defeated Lycian pirates in sea battle;
founder of Gagae: *Etym. Magn.* 219 s.v. Γάγαι

Ogygie

alternative name of Praxidike (s.v.)

Olen

mythical Lycian or Hyperborean epic poet: *Herodotos* 4. 35,
Kallimachos, *hym.* 4. 304-05, *Alex. Polyhist.* ap. *Suidas*
s. v. Ὀλῆν, *Pausanias* 1. 18. 5, 2. 13. 3, 5. 7. 8-9, 8.
21. 3, 9. 27. 2

Pandaros

son of Lykaon, leader of contingent from Zeleia in Trojan War:
Homer, *Il.* 2. 826-27
under protection of Apollo: *Homer*, *Il.* 2. 827, 4. 101, 4. 119
associated with Lycia: *Homer*, *Il.* 5. 105, 5. 173
involvement in combat in Trojan War: *Homer*, *Il.* 4. 86-104, 5.
95-105, 5. 166-240
the 'northern Lycia' subject to Pandaros: *Strabo* 12. 4. 6,
13. 1. 7
cult in Pinara: *Strabo* 14. 3. 5

Pataros

son of Apollo; name derived from patara: *Alex. Polyhist.*
ap. *Steph. Byz.* s.v. Πάταρα
Lycian brigand: *Eustathius*, *Dion. Perieg.* 129

Pegasos (Pagasos)

offspring of Gorgon; tamed by Bellerophon: *Pindar*, *Ol.* 13.
63-92
tamed and given to Bellerophon by Athene: *Pausanias* 2. 4. 1

Peisander

Homeric name for Isander (s.v.)

Perikle

blockade of harbour of Phaselis: *Polyaenus*, *strat.* 5. 42
conquest of Telmessos: *Theopompos* 12, ap. *Photius*, *bib.* 176,
p. 120a 14. 17 (*Jac. II B*, 115, no. 103)

Phanes

Halikarnassian in military service of Amasis; flight to and
capture in Lycia: *Herodotos* 3. 4

Pharnuches

Lycian used as interpreter/guide by Alexander in Persia:
Diodoros 17. 68. 4-7, *Quintus Curtius* 5. 4. 10-13,
Plutarch, *Alex.* 37. 1-2, *Arrian*, *anab.* 4. 3. 7

Philonoe (Antikleia/Casandra)

daughter of Iobates; given in marriage to Bellerophon:
Apollodoros, *bib.* 2. 3. 2

Pinaros

son of Tremilos and Praxidike: *Panyasis*, ap. *Steph. Byz.*
s.v. Τρεμίλη

Praxidike

mother of Kragos, Tloos, Xanthos, and Pinaros: *Panyasis ap.*
Steph. Byz. s.v. Τρεμίλη

Proitos

king of Argos, driven from kingdom by brother Akrisios, seeks
 refuge in Lycia, marries Stheneboea (daughter of Lyc. king), returns
 to Greece and occupies Tiryns with Lyc. army: *Bacchylides 10.*
64-70, Strabo 8. 6. 11, Apollodoros, bib. 2. 2. 1,
Pausanias 2. 25. 7
 sends Bellerophon to Lycia: *Homer, Il. 6. 155-71, Euripides,*
Sthen. Nauck², frags. 661-72, Diodoros 6. 9. 1,
Apollodoros, bib. 2. 3. 1-2, Hyginus, fab. 57, Zenobius,
cent. 2. 87

Ptolemy I (Soter)

conquest of Phaselis and Xanthos: *Diodoros 20. 27. 1*

Ptolemy Philadelphus

overlord of Lycia: *Theokritos 17. 89*
 repaired temple of Apollo at Patara, and renamed city Arsinoe:
Strabo 14. 3. 6

Ptolemy -?

a ruler of Telmessos (perhaps related to Egyptian Ptolemies)
 prior to battle of Magnesia: *Livy 37. 56. 4*

Rhode

daughter of Mopsos; Rhodiapolis named after her: *Theopompas*
12 ap. Photius, bib. 176, p. 120 a 14. 15 (Jac. II B, 115,
no. 103)

Salakia

sea goddess, associated with origin of Patara: *Alex. Polyhist.*
ap. Steph. Byz. s.v. Πάταρα

Sarpedon (in Homeric tradition)

son of Zeus and Laodameia: *Homer, Il. 6. 198-199*
 role as leader of the Lycian contingent at Troy: *Homer, Il.*
2. 876-77, 5. 471-93, 5. 628-98, 12. 101-04, 12. 310-471,
16. 419-526, 16. 532-683, Apollodoros, epit. 3. 35,
Hyginus, fab. 106. 2, Athenaeus, deip. 1. 13, Quintus
Smyrn. 4. 289-90

Sarpedon (the immigrant from Crete)

flight from Crete to Cilicia; becomes king of Lycia:
Apollodoros, bib. 3. 1. 2
 arrival with Termilae in Lycia: *Herodotos 1. 173, 7. 92,*
Strabo 12. 8. 5, 14. 3. 10
 conquest of Lycia; grandfather of the 'Homeric' Sarpedon:
Diodoros 5. 79. 3
 founder of Miletos: *Ephoros ap. Strabo 14. 1. 6, Strabo 12. 8. 5*

Skylakeus

son of Oileus, companion of Glaukos; fled from Trojan War to
 Lycia; stoned to death by Lycian women: *Quintus Smyrn. 10.*
147-66

Solymians

original inhabitants of Lycia: *Homer, Il. 1. 173, Strabo 12.*
8. 5, 14. 3. 10
 basic stock of Kabalia district and Termessos: *Strabo 13. 4.*
16
 listed amongst extinct Asiatic races: *Eratosthenes ap. Pliny,*
nat. 5. 33. 127
 occupied peaks of Taurus range around Lycia: *Strabo 1. 2. 11*
 conflict with Bellerophon: *Homer, Il. 6. 184-85, Pindar, Ol.*
13. 90, Strabo 12. 8. 5, 13. 4. 16, Apollodoros, bib. 2. 3.
2
 Isander, son of Bellerophon, killed in conflict with
 Solymians: *Homer, Il. 6. 203-04*
 cult of Kronos amongst the Solymians: *Plutarch, def. orac.*
421D-E

Solymos

son of Zeus and Chaldene: *Steph Byz. s.v. Μιλύου*
 husband and brother of Milye: *Steph. Byz. s.v. Μιλύδα*

Stheneboea (Anteia)

daughter of Iobates, wife of Proitos; attempted seduction of
 Bellerophon: *Homer, Il. 6. 160-66, Euripides, Sthen.,*
Nauck², frags. 660-72, Diodoros 6. 9. 1, Apollodoros,
bib. 2. 2. 1, 2. 3. 1-2, Hyginus, fab. 57, Zenobius, cent.
2. 87

Telchines

immigrants from Rhodes, founded temple of Apollo beside
 Xanthos r.: *Diodoros 5. 56. 1*
 suggested conflict with Apollo (the latter in wolf guise):
Servius, Verg. Aen. 4. 377

Telephus

dedicated bronze bowl in temple of Apollo at Patara:
Pausanias 9. 41. 1

Tlepolemos

migration to Rhodes: *Homer, Il. 2. 653-70*
 conflict with Sarpedon: *Homer, Il. 5. 628-69*

Tloos

son of Tremilos and Praxidike: *Panyasis ap. Steph. Byz.*
s.v. Τρεμίλη

Tremilos

father of Kragos, Tloos, Xanthos, and Pinaros by Praxidike:
Panyasis ap. Steph. Byz. s.v. Τρεμίλη

Xanthos

son of Tremilos and Praxidike: *Panyasis ap. Steph. Byz.*

s.v. Τρεμίλη

king of Crete; abductor of Europa: *Augustine, civ. D. 18. 12*

of Cretan or Egyptian origin: *Hekataios ap. Steph. Byz.*

s.v. Ἐάνθος

son of Triopas, king of the Pelasgians of Argos; seizes part of

Lycia: *Diodoros 5. 81. 2*

Xerxes

includes Lycia in ship-building programme: *Diodoros 11. 2. 2*

Lycian naval contingent in Xerxes' fleet: *Herodotos 7. 92, 7.*

98, *Diodoros 11. 3. 7*

Zeniketos

Cilician pirate; controlled Phaselis and had stronghold at

Olympos; suicided when Olympos captured by P. Servilius Isauricus:

Strabo 14. 5. 7

Zeus

father of Sarpedon: *Diodoros 5. 79. 3, Apollodoros, epit. 3.*

35

orders Apollo to prepare Sarpedon's body for burial: *Homer,*

Il. 16. 666-75

husband of Leto: *Quintus Smyrn. 11. 22*

(A list of the references to the Lycian epichoric inscriptions dealt with in this volume. References in bold type indicate pages where all or part of the inscription in question is translated.)

TL 1.	73, 150-51
2.	61, 121
3.	61, 73, 121, 161
4.	61, 73
6.	52, 55, 61, 73-74, 151, 151-53, 163, 182
7.	66-67, 74, 139
8.	74, 138, 139
11.	49, 60, 74, 121, 133-34, 161
16.	61, 83
17.	60
20.	60
22.	130, 132
23.	52
24.	89
25.	52, 55, 68, 89, 90, 139, 164, 165
26.	61, 63, 89, 130, 173, 174
27.	89, 90, 164
28.	89, 148, 151
29.	49, 130, 133, 139, 161, 165
31.	61, 121
32.	52, 166
35.	49, 61, 89, 130, 134
36.	60, 61, 74-75, 121, 139, 148
37.	75, 138, 161
38.	61, 121, 131, 163
39.	61, 75, 121, 147-48
40.	47, 111, 113, 161
41.	61, 147
42.	60, 121
43.	46, 133
44.	46, 47, 52, 55, 61, 70-71, 89, 97-98, 107-08, 109-10, 130, 131, 134, 135, 136, 148, 160, 161, 166, 174, 175, 177, 178, 180, 181, 185, 186, 187, 189
45.	52, 89
46.	60, 121
47.	61, 121
48.	117, 138, 187
49.	75, 117, 131
50.	60, 121, 122
51.	89
52.	76, 121
54.	57, 89, 131
55.	71, 89
56.	52, 68, 76, 124, 174, 175
57.	76-77, 118, 121, 130, 173
58.	121, 175, 188
59.	139
61.	47, 77, 112, 113, 133, 160
64.	47, 133, 161

65. 49-50, 53, 89, 130, 174, 175, 189
 67. 46-47, 133
 69. 57
 70. 52, 139
 74. 127, 148
 75. 77, 121, 174
 76. 148, 174
 77. 46, 133, 161
 78. 148, 163
 80. 173, 174
 82. 139
 83. 46-47, 130, 133, 135, 148, 149-50, 174, 179
 84. 61, 69-70, 77-78, 126, 130, 136, 139, 142
 86. 78, 138
 87. 148, 160
 88. 67, 78-79, 130, 135, 164, 174
 89. 79, 130, 138
 90. 58, 130, 163
 91. 79-80, 164
 92. 130
 93. 79, 80, 124, 164, 174
 94. 80, 130, 174
 95. 130, 135, 138, 139, 142
 101. 81
 102. 81-82, 125, 174, 175, 189
 103. 46-47, 58, 117, 133, 163
 104. 48, 58, 111-12, 164
 106. 57, 82, 121, 130, 135, 175, 187, 189
 107. 61, 62, 82, 116
 108. 147
 110. 174
 111. 81, 82-83, 125, 130, 131, 174, 179
 112. 175
 113. 139, 160
 114. 61, 83, 121
 115. 61, 121
 116. 151, 163
 117. 52, 67-68, 83, 164
 118. 83, 121, 124, 130, 135
 121. 83-84, 175, 189
 124. 60, 84, 116
 125. 47
 127. 138, 148, 164
 131. 61, 81, 82, 84-85, 124-25, 125, 174
 132. 46-47, 133
 133. 46-47, 130, 132
 134. 52, 55, 130
 135. 47, 121, 124, 174, 178
 136. 139
 138. 85
 139. 85, 121, 124, 175, 188
 143. 52, 55, 85-86, 131
 145. 61, 121, 174

146. 138
 149. 57, 81, 86, 121, 130, 132, 164, 173, 174, 175, 178, 189
 150. 87, 127, 130, 135, 151, 164, 174, 178
 151. 54
 152. 53
 N 300. 45
 302. 52, 149
 304. 89
 306. 87, 130, 137, 175-76, 189
 307. 45, 174, 178
 309. 175-76, 189
 310. 46, 87-88, 133, 161
 311. 44, 52, 89, 94, 161
 312. 44, 52, 89, 165, 181
 313. 45
 314. 46-47, 133, 181
 315. 47, 161
 318. 89, 161
 319. 53-54, 89
 320. 44, 48-49, 52, 55, 62-63, 68-70, 79, 84, 89, 91-93, 114, 130, 131, 132, -33, 135, 165, 166, 169-71, 174, 175, 182, 186-87, 191-93
 322. 60, 88, 130, 131, 174, 179
 323. 45
 N Suppl.
 1. 43-44, 46, 53, 89, 95
 2. 44, 52, 89
 3. 44, 89
 4. 44, 89
 5. 44
 6. 44
 7. 44

Akurgal E.

(1961), *Die Kunst Anatoliens*, Berlin.

Albright W.J.

(1950), 'Some Oriental Glosses on the Homeric Problem',
AJA 54, 162-76.

Allen T.

(1921), *The Homeric Catalogue of Ships*, Oxford.

Archi A.

(1971), 'The Propaganda of Hattusili III', *SMEA* 14,
185-215.

Arkwright W.

(1895), 'The Frontiers of Lycia and Caria', *JHS* 15, 93-99.

(1899), 'Über das lykische Alphabet', *JOAI* 2, 52-76.

(1911), 'Penalties in Lycian Epitaphs of Hellenistic and
Roman Times', *JHS* 31, 269-75.

(1923), 'Lycian Epitaphs' in *Anatolian Studies presented to
Sir William Mitchell Ramsay*, ed. Buckler, W.H. and Calder,
W.M., Manchester, 15-25.

Asheri D.

(1983), *Fra Ellenismo e Iranismo*, Bologna.

Astour M.C.

(1965), 'New Evidence on the Last Days of Ugarit', *AJA* 69,
253-58.

(1967), *Hellenosemitica*, Leiden, 2nd ed.

Atlan S.

(1958), 'Eine in Side geprägte lykische Münze', *Anatolia*
3, 89-95.

von Aulock H.

(1974), *Die Münzprägung des Gordian III und der
Tranquillina in Lykien*, Tübingen.

Babelon E.

(1893), *Les perses achéménides, les satrapes et les
dynastes tributaires de leur empire, Cypre et Phénice*,
Paris.

(1910), *Traité des monnaies grecques et romaines, II. 2*,
Paris.

Bachofen J.J.

(1861), *Das Mutterrecht*, Basel (repr. 1948).

(1862), *Das lykische Volk und seine Bedeutung für die
Entwicklung des Alterthums*, Freiburg in Breisgau.

Badian E.

(1977), 'A Document of Artaxerxes IV?', in *Studies
Presented to Fritz Schachermeyr on the Occasion of his*

*Eightieth Birthday, Greece and the Eastern
Mediterranean in Ancient History and Prehistory*, ed.
Kinzl K.H., Berlin, NY., 40-50.

Barnett R.D.

(1974), 'A Silver Head-Vase with Lycian Inscriptions' in
Mansel'e Armagan Mélanges Mansel, Ankara, 893-901.

(1975), 'The Sea Peoples', *CAH* II. 2³, 359-78.

Bayburtluoğlu C.

(1980), *Lykia*.

(1982), 'Das soziale und wirtschaftliche Leben in Arykanda
(Lykien)' in *Palast und Hütte*, ed. D. Papenfuss and V.M.
Strocka, Mainz-am-Rhein.

Beal R.H.

(1983), 'The Succession of Arnuwanda I and his Relationship
to Queen Asmunikal', *JCS* 35, 117-18.

Bean G.E.

(1948), 'Notes and Inscriptions from Lycia', *JHS* 68, 40-58.

(1954), 'Notes and Inscriptions from Kaunos', *JHS* 74,
85-110.

(1958), 'Die Lage von Phellos', *Anz. phil.-hist. Kl. Öst.
Ak. Wiss.*, Vienna, 49-58.

(1968), *Turkey's Southern Shore*, London.

(1971), *Journeys in northern Lycia, 1965-67*, Vienna.

(1978), *Lycian Turkey*, London.

(1979), *Aegean Turkey*, London, 2nd ed.

Beaufort F.

(1818), *Karamania*, London, 2nd ed.

Beneviste E.

(1966), *Titres et noms propres en iranien ancien*, Paris.

(1969), *Le vocabulaire des institutions indoeuropéennes*,
Paris.

Berndorf O. and Niemann G.

(1884), *Reisen in Lykien und Karien*, Vienna.

Bernard P.

(1964), 'Une pièce d'armure perse sur un monument lycien',
Syria 41, 195-212.

Bissett K.A.

(1971), 'Who were the Amazons?', *Greece and Rome*, 2nd
series, 18, 150-01.

Blinkenberg C.

(1915), *Die lindische Tempelchronik*, Bonn.

(1941), *Lindos, fouilles et recherches, 1902-14. II.1:*
Les inscriptions, Berlin-Copenhagen.

Blumenthal E.

- (1963), 'Die altgriechische Siedlungskolonisation im Mittelmeerraum unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Südküste Kleinasien', *Tübinger geographische Studien*, 10, Tübingen, 128-32.

Blomqvist J.

- (1982), 'Translation Greek in the Trilingual Inscription of Xanthos', *Opuscula Atheniensia* 14, 11-20.

Bockish G.

- (1969), 'Die Karier und ihre Dynasten', *Klio* 51, 117-75.

Borchhardt J.

- (1967), 'Limyra, Sitz des lykischen Dynasten Perikles', *Ist. Mitt.* 17, 151-67.
 (1968) (and Neumann G.), 'Dynastische Grabanlagen von Kadyanda', *AA* 83, 174-238.
 (1969-70), 'Ein Totengericht in Lykien, zum Grabmal des Xitabura in Limyra', *Ist. Mitt.* 19-20, 187-222.
 (1970), 'Das Heroon von Limyra - Grabmal des lykischen Königs Perikles', *AA* 85, 353-90.
 (1972), 'Der Triumphierende Perseus in Lykien', *Antike Welt* 3, 1972, 2-16.
 (1973), 'Limyra, Bericht der III Grabungskampagne 1971', *TAD* 20/1, 37-62.
 (1974) (and Wurster W.), 'Megalith-Gräber in Lykien', *AA* 89, 514-38.
 (1975), *Myra eine lykische Metropole*, Berlin.
 (1985) (et al.), 'Das Grabmal des Sohnes des Ta aus Hoiran in Zentrallykien', *JOAI* 55, 70-124.

Bousquet J.

- (1975), 'Arbinas, fils de Gergis, dynaste de Xanthos', *CRAI*, 138-48.

Breasted J.H.

- (1962), *Ancient Records of Egypt*, Vol. III, New York (reissue of 1906 ed.).

Bryce T.R.

- (1974), 'The Lukka Problem - and a Possible Solution', *JNES* 33, 395-404.
 (1975), 'Lycian piye- and the Allocation of Burial Rights', *RHA* 33, 31-41.
 (1976a), 'Burial Fees in the Lycian Sepulchral Inscriptions', *AS* 26, 175-90.
 (1976b), 'The Lycian ϵ variants as a Dating Criterion for the Lycian Texts', *Kadmos* 15, 168-70.
 (1977), 'Pandaros, a Lycian at Troy', *AJP* 98, 213-18.
 (1978), 'Two Terms of Relationship in the Lycian Inscriptions', *JNES* 37, 217-25.
 (1978-79), 'A Recently Discovered Cult in Lycia', *Journal of Religious History* 10, 115-27.

- (1979a), 'Lycian Tomb Families and their Social Implications', *JESHO* 22, 296-313.
 (1979b), 'The Role of the Lukka People in Late Bronze Age Anatolia', *Antichthon* 13, 1-11.
 (1980a), 'Burial Practices in Lycia', *The Mankind Quarterly* 21, 165-78.
 (1980b), 'The Other Pericles', *Historia* 29, 377-81.
 (1980c), 'Sacrifices to the Dead in Lycia', *Kadmos* 19, 41-49.
 (1981a), 'Disciplinary Agents in the Lycian Sepulchral Inscriptions', *AS* 31, 81-93.
 (1981b), review of Neumann G., *Neufunde lykische Inschriften seit 1901*, *BiOr* 38, 225-33.
 (1982a), 'A Ruling Dynasty in Lycia', *Klio* 64, 329-37.
 (1982b), *Historical and Social Documents of the Hittite World*, University of Queensland.
 (1983a), 'Political Unity in Lycia during the Dynastic Period', *JNES* 42, 31-42.
 (1983b), 'The Arrival of the Goddess Leto in Lycia', *Historia* 32, 1-13.
 (1985), 'A Reinterpretation of the Milawata Letter in the light of the New Join Piece', *AS* 35, 13-23.

Burn A.R.

- (1930), *Minoans, Philistines, and Greeks*, London.

Cameron A.

- (1939), $\theta\pi\epsilon\rho\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ and Related Terms in the Inscriptions of Asia Minor' in *Anatolian Studies presented to W. Buckler*, ed Calder W.M. and Keil J., Manchester, 27-62.

Carruba O.

- (1968), 'Die I. und II. Pers. Plur. im Luwische und im Lykischen', *Die Sprache* 14, 13-23.
 (1969), 'Die satzeinleitenden Partikeln in den Indogermanischen Sprachen Anatoliens', *Incunabula Graeca*, vol 32, Rome.
 (1970), 'Contributi al Licio', *SMEA* 11, 27-42.
 (1974), 'I Termini per Mese, Anno, e i Numerali in Licio', *RIL* 108, 575-97.
 (1977), 'Commentario alla Trilingue Licio-Greco-Aramaica di Xanthos', *SMEA* 18, 273-318.
 (1979), 'Commento alle nuove iscrizioni di Licia' in *Studia Mediterranea*, 75-95.

Catling H.W.

- (1975), 'Cyprus in the Late Bronze Age' in *CAH* II. 2³, 188-216.

Childs W.A.P.

- (1979), 'The Authorship of the Inscribed Pillar of Xanthos', *AS* 29, 97-102.
 (1981), 'Lycian Relations with Persians and Greeks in the 5th and 4th centuries Re-examined', *AS* 31, 55-80.

Contini R.

(1981), review of Metzger H. et al., *Fouilles de Xanthos*, Tome VI, *Oriens Antiquus* 20, 231-35.

Cook J.M.

(1983), *The Persian Empire*, London.

Coulton J.J.

(1982), 'Termessians at Oinoanda', *AS* 32, 115-31.

Coupeil P. and Demargne P.

(1963), See Metzger, 1963.

(1969), *Fouilles de Xanthos*, Tome III, le monument des Néréides, Paris.

Deecke W.

(1889), 'Lykische Studien IV' in *Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen* (ed. A. Bezzenberger) XIV Göttingen, 181 ff.

Delcourt M.

(1958), *Hermaphrodite: mythes et rites de la bisexualité dans l'antiquité classique*, Paris.

(1962-63), 'The Legend of Sarpedon and the Saga of the Archer', *History of Religions* 2, 33-51.

Deltour-Lévie C.

(1982), *Les piliers funéraires de Lycie*, Louvain.

Demargne P.

(1958), *Fouilles de Xanthos*, Tome I, les piliers funéraires, Paris.

(1967) (and Metzger H.), 'Xanthos' in *RE* IX A/2, 1375-1408.

(1969), See Coupeil, 1969.

(1974), *Fouilles de Xanthos*, Tome V, tombes-maisons, tombes rupestres et sarcophages, Paris.

(1979), 'Athéna, les dynastes lyciens et les héros grecs' in *Florilegium Anatolicum* 97-101.

Devambez P.

(1960), 'Les piliers funéraires de Xanthos', *Journal des Savants*, 34-42.

Dittenberger W.

(1903-05), *Oriens Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae: supplementum sylloges inscriptionum Graecarum*, Leipzig (= OGIS).

Dunbabin J.J.

(1953), 'Bellerophon, Herakles, and Chimaera' in *Studies presented to David M. Robinson*, Vol II, St. Louis, 1164-84.

Dupont-Sommer A.

(1974), 'La stèle trilingue récemment découverte au Létôon de Xanthos: le texte araméen', *CRAI*, 132-49.

(1979), 'L'inscription araméenne' in *Fouilles de Xanthos* VI: la stèle trilingue du Létôon, Paris, 129-69.

Eichner H.

(1983), 'Etymologische Beiträge der Trilingue vom Letoon bei Xanthos', *Orientalia* 52, 48-66.

Eilers W.

(1940), 'Kleinasiatisches' *ZDMG* 94, 189-233

Farnell L.R.

(1907), *The Cults of the Greek States*, Vol. IV, Oxford.

Florilegium Anatolicum

(1979), *Mélanges offerts à Emmanuel Laroche*, Paris.

Fraser J.

(1927), *The Golden Bough*, Part IV, Vol II, London.

Frei P.

(1967), 'Bemerkungen zu lykischen Münzlegenden', *Schweizer Münzblätter* 67, 85-90.

(1976), 'Die Trilingue vom Letoon, die lykischen Zahlzeichen und das lykische Geldsystem', *Schweizerische Numismatische Rundschau* 55, 5-16.

(1977) (as for 1976), 56, 66-78.

(1978), 'Die Lykier bei Homer', in *Procs. of the Xth International Congress of Classical Archaeology*, 819-27.

(1981), review of Metzger H. et al., *Fouilles de Xanthos*, Tome VI, *BiOr* 38, 354-71.

Friedrich J.

(1930), *Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache*, *MVAG* 24. 1.

(1932), *Kleinasiatische Sprachdenkmäler*, Berlin.

Gaisford T. (ed.)

(1967), *Etymologicon Magnum*, Amsterdam (reprint of 1848 ed.).

Garbini G.

(1977), 'Osservazioni sul testo aramaico della trilingue di Xanthos', *SMEA* 18, 273-318.

Gardiner A.

(1975), *The Kadesh Inscriptions of Ramesses II*, Oxford (repr. of 1966 ed.).

Garstang J.

(1910), *The Land of the Hittites*, London.

- Garstang J. and Gurney O.R.
(1959), *The Geography of the Hittite Empire*, London.
- Gates C.
(1974), 'The Luwian '12 Gods'', *AJA* 78, 165-66.
- Goetze A.
(1957), *Kleinasien* 2, Munich.
(1960), review of Garstang and Gurney, *The Geog. of the Hittite Empire*, *JCS* 14, 43-48.
(1967), *Die Annalen des Mursilis*, Darmstadt, repr. of 1933 ed. appearing in *MVAG* 38.
(1968), *Madduwattas*, Darmstadt, repr. of 1928 ed. appearing in *MVAG* 32, 1.
- Gurney O.R.
(1940), *Hittite Prayers of Mursili II*, University of Liverpool.
(1980), *The Hittites*, Harmondsworth.
- Gusmani R.
(1960), 'Concordanze e Discordanze nella Flessione Nominale del Licio e del Luvio', *RIL* 94, 497-512.
(1962), 'Kleinasiatische Verwandtschaftsnamen', *Die Sprache* 8, 177-83.
(1963), 'Kleinasiatische Miscellen', *IF* 68, 284-94.
(1968), 'Zur Deutung einiger milyischer Wörter', *AO* 36, 1-18.
(1975), 'In margine alla trilingue licio-greco-aramaica di Xanthos', *Incontri Linguistici* 2, 61-75.
(1977) 'Randbemerkungen zur Trilingue von Xanthos', *ZDMG* Suppl. III, 1, 52-54.
(1979a), 'Lykisch smmati', in *Florilegium Anatolicum*, 129-36.
(1979b), 'Su due termini della trilingue di Xanthos' in *Studia Mediterranea*, 225-34.
- Güterbock H.G.
(1983), 'The Ahhiyawa Problem Reconsidered', *AJA* 87, 133-38.
- Hahn I.
(1981), 'Periöken und Periökenbesitz in Lykien', *Klio* 63, 51-61.
- Hallock R.T.
(1969), *Persepolis Fortification Tablets*, Chicago.
- Hamp B.H.
(1980), 'Lycian ahba', *JNES* 39, 215-16.
- Hansen E. and LeRoy C.
(1976), 'Au Létöon de Xanthos: les deux temples de Létö', *RA* fasc. 2, 317-36.

- Hansen P.A.
(1975), *A List of Greek Verse Inscriptions down to 400 B.C.*, Copenhagen.
- Hawkins D.
(1974), appendix to Barnett R.D., 'A Silver Head-Vase with Lycian Inscriptions', *Mélanges Mansel*, 902-03.
- Head B.V.
(1887), *Historia Numorum*, Oxford.
- Heinhold-Krahmer S.
(1977), *Arzawa (Texte der Hethiter 8)*, Heidelberg.
- Hestermann F.
(1929), *Matriarchale lykische Inschriften*, Utrecht.
- Heubeck A.
(1975), 'Überlegungen zum lykischen Plural', *Incontri Linguistici* 2, 77-88.
(1980a), review of Metzger H. et al., *Fouilles de Xanthos, Tome VI, Gnomon* 52, 560-61.
(1980b), review of Neumann G., *Neufunde lykische Inschriften seit 1901*, *Kratylos* 24, 77-81.
(1981), 'Weiteres zur lykischen Verbalflexion', *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 95, 158-73.
(1982), 'Zur lykischen Verbalflexion' in *Serta Indogermanica*, 107-19.
- Hoffner H.A.
(1982), 'The Milawata Letter Augmented and Reinterpreted', *Afo Beiheft* 19, 130-37.
- Hope-Simpson R.
(1965), *A Gazetteer and Atlas of Mycenaean Sites*, London.
- Hornblower S.
(1982), *Mausolos*, Oxford.
- Houwink ten Cate Ph. H. J.
(1965), *The Luwian Population Groups of Lycia and Cilicia Aspera during the Hellenistic Period*, Leiden.
(1970), *The Records of the Early Hittite Empire*, Istanbul.
- Hurter S.
(1979), 'Der Tissaphernes-Fund' in *Greek Numismatics and Archaeology*, ed. Mörkholm O. and Waggoner N., Belgium, 97-108.
- Imbert J.
(1891), 'Notes on the Writings of the Lycian Monuments', *BOR* 5, 105-14.
(1893), *Études d'histoire lycienne*, *Le Muséon* 12, 235-43.

- (1894), 'Les termes de parenté dans les inscriptions lyciennes', *MSL* 8, 449-72.
 (1896), 'Une épitaphe lycienne', *MSL* 9, 196-232.
 (1898), 'De quelques inscriptions lyciennes', *MSL* 10, 24-58 and 207-27.
 (1900), 'De quelques inscriptions lyciennes', *MSL* 11, 217-57.
- Jameson S.
 (1973), 'Lykia' in *RE* XIII (Suppl.) 265-308.
- Jenkins G.K.
 (1959), 'Recent Acquisitions of Greek Coins by the British Museum', *NC* 6th Series, Vol 19, 23-45.
- Jones A.H.M.
 (1971), *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, (rev. by M. Avi-Yonah et al.), Oxford, 2nd ed.
- Jordan B.
 (1975), *The Athenian Navy in the Classical Period*, Univ. of California.
- Kalinka E.
 (1901), *Tituli Asiae Minoris: Tituli Lyciae lingua Lycia conscripti*, Vienna (cited as TL).
 (1920-44), *Tituli Asiae Minoris: Tituli Lyciae linguis Graeca et Latina conscripti*, Vienna (cited as TAM II).
- Keil J. and von Premerstein A.
 (1914), *Bericht über eine dritte Reise in Lydien*, Vienna.
- Kishimoto M.
 (1965), 'Lykisch *wawa', *Anadolu Arastirmalari*, Istanbul, 283-86.
- Kleiner G.
 (1969), 'Stand der Erforschung von Alt-Milet', *Ist. Mitt.* 19/20, 113-23.
- Knapp A.B.
 (1980), 'Alasiya and Hatti', *JCS* 32, 43-47.
- Knudtzon J.A.
 (1915) *Die El-Amarna Tafeln*, Leipzig (=EA).
- König F.W.
 (1936), 'Die Stele von Xanthos I', *Klitho* I, Vienna.
- Korol'ov A. and Sevoroskin V.
 (1969), 'Lykische Wörter und Namen', *AO* 37, 23-44.

- Kretschmer P.
 (1933), 'Die Hypachäer', *Glotta* 21, 213-57,
 (1939), 'Die Stellung der lykischen Sprache I', *Glotta* 27, 256-61,
 (1940), 'Die Stellung der lykischen Sprache II', *Glotta* 28, 101-16.
- Kruse
 (1927), 'Lykeios' in *RE* XIII, 2268-70.
- Kubinska J.
 (1968), *Les monuments funéraires dans les inscriptions grecques de l'Asie Mineure*, Warsaw.
- Laroche E.
 (1957-58), 'Comparaison du louvite et du lycien', *BSL* 53, 159-97.
 (1958), 'Études de vocabulaire VII', *RHA* 63, 85-114.
 (1959), *Dictionnaire de la langue louvite*, Paris.
 (1960), 'Comparaison' (cont.), *BSL* 55, 155-85.
 (1966), *Les noms des Hittites*, Paris.
 (1967), 'Comparaison' (cont.), *BSL* 62, 46-64.
 (1971), *Catalogue des textes hittites*, Paris (= CTH)
 (1974a), 'La stèle trilingue récemment découverte au Létôon de Xanthos: le texte lycien', *CRAI* 115-25.
 (1974b), 'Les épitaphes lyciennes' in *Fouilles de Xanthos*, Tome V, Paris, 123-49.
 (1976), 'Lyciens et Termiles', *RA* fasc. 1, 15-19.
 (1979a), 'Les représentants lyciens de l'anatolien appa' in *Studia Mediterranea* 2, 347-52.
 (1979b), 'L'inscription lycienne' in *Fouilles de Xanthos*, Tome VI, Paris, 49-127.
 (1980), 'Les dieux de la Lycie classique d'après les textes lyciens', in *Actes du Colloque sur la Lycie Antique*, Paris, 1-6.
- Larsen J.A.O.
 (1945), 'Representation and Democracy in Hellenistic Federalism', *Classical Philology*, 40, 65-97.
 (1956), 'The Araxa Inscription and the Lycian Confederacy', *Classical Philology* 51, 151-69.
 (1968), *Greek Federal States*, Oxford (espec. 240-63 on the Lycian Confederacy).
- Lebrun R.
 (1977), 'L'état actuel de la connaissance du lycien', *Hethitica* II, 155-58.
- Lethaby W.R.
 (1917), 'The Earlier Temple of Artemis at Ephesus', *JHS* 37, 1-16.
- Macqueen J.
 (1968), 'Geography and History in Western Asia Minor in the

- 2nd Millennium B.C.', *AS* 18, 169-85.
 (1975), *The Hittites and their contemporaries in Asia Minor*, London.
- Magie D.
 (1975), *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the 3rd Century after Christ*, Princeton (repr. of 1950 ed.).
- Malten L.
 (1925), 'Bellerophon', *JDAI* 40, 121-60.
 (1944), 'Homer und die lykischen Fürsten', *Hermes* 79, 1-12.
- Masson E.
 (1979), 'Les inscriptions louvites hiéroglyphiques d'Emirgazi', *Journal des Savants*, 1-49.
- Masson O.
 (1974), 'Notes d'épigraphie carienne', *Kadmos* 13, 127-30.
 (1977), 'Notes d'épigraphie carienne III-V', *Kadmos* 16, 87-94.
- Mee C.
 (1978), 'Aegean Trade and Settlement in Anatolia in the 2nd Millennium B.C.', *AS* 28, 121-56.
- Mélanges Mansel
 (1974) *Mansel'e Armağan, Mélanges Mansel*, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, Ankara.
- Mellink M. J.
 (1964), (and subsequent years) 'Excavations at Karataş-Semayük in Lycia', *AJA* 68 etc.
 (1974), 'Archaeology in Asia Minor', *AJA* 78, 105-30.
 (1980), 'Archaeology in Asia Minor', *AJA* 84, 501-18.
 (1983), 'Archaeological Comments on the Ahhiyawa-Achaean in Western Anatolia', *AJA* 87, 138-41.
- Mercer S. A. B.
 (1939), *The Tell-El-Amarna Tablets*, Toronto.
- Meriggi P.
 (1928), 'La declinazione de Licio', *Rendiconti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei*, Ser. VI, vol. 4, 410-50.
 (1930), 'Beiträge zur lykischen Syntax', *KLF* 1, 414-61.
 (1936), 'Der Indogermanismus des lykischen', *Festschrift für Herman Hirt*, ed. Arntz H., Heidelberg, vol. 2, 257-82.
 (1963), 'Anatolische Satzpartikeln', *RHA* 72, 1-33.
 (1978), 'Appunti sul licio', *Incontri Linguistici* 4, 43-48.
 (1979), 'La declinazione del Licio', (Part II), *Rendiconti* etc. Ser. VIII, vol. 33, 243-68.
 (1980), 'La declinazione dei nomi propri e dei pronomi in licio', *SMEA* 22, 215-74.

- Merritt
 (1932), *Athenian Financial Documents of the Fifth Century*, Ann Arbor.
- Metzger H.
 (1963) (and Coupel P.), *Fouilles de Xanthos, Tome II, l'acropole lycienne*, Paris.
 (1966), 'Fouilles du Létôon de Xanthos (1962-65)', *RA*, 101-12.
 (1967), see Demargne, 1967.
 (1970), 'Fouilles du Létôon de Xanthos (1966-69)', *RA*, 307-22.
 (1972), *Fouilles de Xanthos, Tome IV, les céramiques archaïques et classiques de l'acropole lycienne*, Paris.
 (1974a) (et al.), *Fouilles du Létôon de Xanthos*, *RA* fasc. 2, 313-40.
 (1974b), 'La stèle trilingue récemment découverte au Létôon de Xanthos: le texte grec', *CRAI*, 82-93.
 (1979), 'Le sanctuaire de Létô' and 'L'inscription grecque' in *Fouilles de Xanthos*, Tome VI, Paris, 5-48.
- Metzger H. and Laroche E.
 (1974), 'Notes sur la stèle trilingue du Létôon de Xanthos', *Kadmos* 13, 82-84.
- Meyer E.
 (1975), *Geschichte des Altertums* IV, 1, Darmstadt (repr. of 1939 ed.).
- Miller M.
 (1970), *The Sicilian Colony Dates*, Albany.
- Monro
 (1890), ed. of *Iliad* I-XII, Oxford.
- Mörkholm O.
 (1964), 'The Classification of Lycian coins before Alexander the Great', *JNG* 14, 65-76.
 (1971), See Olçay and Mörkholm.
- Mörkholm O. and Neumann G.
 (1978), Die lykischen Münzlegenden, *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*.
- Mörkholm O. and Zahle J.
 (1972), 'The Coinage of Kuprilli', *Act. Arch.* 43, 57-113.
 (1976), 'The Coinages of the Lycian Dynasts Kheriga, Kherēi, and Erbbina', *Act. Arch.* 47, 47-90.
- Nauck A.
 (1889), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Leipzig, 2nd ed.
- Neumann G.
 (1955), 'Der lykische Ortsname Patara', *BZN* 6, 112-14.

- (1961a), 'Beiträge zum Lykischen', *Die Sprache* 7, 70-76.
 (1961b), *Untersuchungen zum Weiterleben hethitischen und luwischen Sprachgutes in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit*, Wiesbaden.
 (1962), 'Beiträge zum Lykischen II', *Die Sprache* 8, 203-12.
 (1967), 'Beiträge zum Lykischen III', *Die Sprache* 13, 31-38.
 (1968), See Borchhardt, 1968.
 (1969), 'Lykisch' in *Alt Kleinasiatische Sprachen, Handbuch der Orientalistik*, Abtlg. I Bd. II, Leiden, 358-96.
 (1969-70), 'Der epigraphische-sprachliche Befund', in Borchhardt J., 1969-70, 218-219.
 (1970), 'Beiträge zum Lykischen IV', *Die Sprache* 16, 54-62.
 (1971), 'Neue Funde und Forschungen in Lykien' *Jahrbuch der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*, 34-49.
 (1974a), 'Beiträge zum Lykischen V', *Die Sprache* 20, 109-14.
 (1974b), 'Ein weiterer Göttername in den lykischen Inschriften' in *Mélanges Mansel*, 637-41.
 (1975), 'Die lykische Grabinschriften von Myra', in Borchhardt, 1975, 150-56.
 (1976), 'Die Aussage der lykischen Inschriften TL 24 und 26', *RA*, 83-87.
 (1978), see Mörkholm and Neumann.
 (1979a), 'Namen und Epiklesen lykischer Götter', in *Florilegium Anatolicum*, 259-71.
 (1979b), *Neufunde lykischer Inschriften seit 1901*, Vienna.
 (1982/83), 'Zur Erschliessung des Lykischen' in *Le lingue indoeuropee di frammentaria attestazione, Atti del Convegno della Società Italiana di Glottologia e della Indogermanische Gesellschaft* (Udine 1981), Pisa, 135-51.
 (1985), see Borchhardt et al, 1985.

Nilsson M.P.

(1933), *Homer and Mycenae*, London.

Nougayrol J. (et. al.)

(1968), *Ugaritica V, Mission de Ras Shamra Tome XVI*, Paris.

Oettinger N.

(1976/77), 'Nochmals zum lykischen Plural', *Incontri Linguistici* 3, 133-35.

Olçay N. and Mörkholm O.

(1971), 'The Coin Hoard from Podalia', *NC 7th Series*, 11, 1-29.

Omerod H.A. and Robinson E.S.G.

(1914), 'Inscriptions from Lycia', *JHS* 34, 1-35.

Page D.L.

(1959), *History and the Homeric Iliad*, University of California.

Paton W.R. and Hicks E.L.

(1891), *The Inscriptions of Tlos*, Oxford.

Pedersen H.

(1945), *Lykisch und Hittitisch*, Copenhagen.

Pembroke S.

(1965), 'The Last of the Matriarchs, a study in the inscriptions of Lycia', *JESHO* 8, 217-47.

Peppermüller R.

(1962), 'Die Glaukos-Diomedes-Szene der Ilias', *Wiener Studien* 75, 5-21.

Petersen E. and von Luschan F.

(1889), *Reisen in Lykien, Milyas, und Kibyratis*, Vienna.

Pirenne J.

(1950), 'La politique d'expansion hittite envisagée à travers les traités de vassalité et de protectorat', *AO 18*, 1-2.

Pritchard J.B.

(1969), *Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament*, Princeton.

Ramsay W.M.

(1895), *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, Oxford.

Rawson B.

(1966), 'Family Life among the Lower Classes at Rome in the First Two Centuries of the Empire', *Classical Philology* 61, 74-83.

Robert J. and L.

(commentaries in *Bulletin Epigraphique*)

(1974), *REG* 87, 290-92, no. 553.

(1976), *REG* 89, 550-51, no. 661.

(1980), *REG* 93, 458, no. 486.

Robert L.

(1946), 'Un dieu anatolien: Kakasbos', *Hellenica* 3, 38-74.

(1949), 'Divinités d'Anatolie', *Hellenica* 7, 50-58.

(1962), *Villes d'Asie Mineure*, Paris, 2nd ed.

(1966), *Documents de l'Asie Mineure méridionale*, Paris.

(1975), 'Une nouvelle inscription grecque de Sardes',

CRAI, 306-30.

(1978), 'Les conquêtes d'Arbinas', *Journal des Savants*, 3-48.

Robinson E.S.G.

(1914), 'Coins from Lycia and Pamphylia', *JHS* 34, 36-46.

Roscher W.H. (ed.)

(1977), *Ausführliche Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, vol. IV (repr. of 1909-15 ed.), NY.

Ruge W.

(1934), 'Telmessos' in *RE* VA, 409-15.

Sakellariou M.B.

(1958), *La migration grecque en Ionie*, Athens.

Sandars N.K.

(1978), *The Sea Peoples*, London.

Schadewaldt W.

(1938), *Iliasstudien*, Leipzig.

Schmidt M.

(1968), *The Lycian Inscriptions after the Accurate Copies of the late Augustus Schoenborn*, Jena.

(1876), *Commentatio de inscriptionibus lyciis*, Leipzig.

Schmitt R.

(1977), review of Mörholm and Zahle, 1976, *Bzn*

(1982a), 'Iranische Namen in den indogermanischen Sprachen Kleinasien' in *Iranisches Personennamenbuch*, ed.

Mayrhofer M. and Schmitt R., Bd. V, fasc. 4, Vienna, 17-28.

(1982b), 'Iranische Wörter und Namen im Lykischen', in *Serta Indogermanica*, 373-88.

von Schuler E.

(1957), *Hethitische Dienstanweisung für höhere Hof- und Staatsbeamte*, Afo, Beiheft 10.

Schwabacher W.

(1968), 'Lycian Coin Portraits' in *Essays in Greek Coinage presented to Stanley Robinson*, ed. Kraay C.M. and Jenkins G.K., Oxford, 111-24.

Serta Indogermanica

see under Tischler.

Sevoroskin V.

(1964), 'On Karian', *RHA* 74, (Tome 22), 1-55.

(1969), see Korol'ov and Sevoroskin.

Shafer R.

(1950), 'Lycian Numerals', *AO* 18. 4, 251-61.

(1951), 'Greek Transcription of Lukian', *Jahrbuch für Kleinasiatistische Forschung* 2, 1-12.

(1959), 'System of Relationship in Lukian', *Die Welt des Orients* 2, 484-501.

(1965), 'A Break in the Carian Dam', *Antiquité Classique* 34, 398-424.

Shapur Shahbazi A.

(1975), *The Irano-Lycian Monuments. The Principal Antiquities of Xanthos and its Region as Evidence for Iranian Aspects of Achaemenid Lycia*, Teheran.

Singer I.

(1983), 'Western Anatolia in the 13th Century B.C. according to the Hittite Sources', *AS* 33, 205-17.

Sommer F.

(1932), *Die Ahhiyavā-Urkunden*, Munich.

Spratt T.A.B. and Forbes E.

(1847), *Travels in Lycia, Milyas, and the Kibyratias* (2 vols.), London.

Stark F.

(1956), *The Lycian Shore*, London.

Starr C.G.

(1975), 'Greeks and Persians in the 4th Century', *Iranica Antiqua* 11, 39-99.

(1977), as above, 12, 49-115.

Stoltenberg H.

(1955), *Die termilische Sprache Lykiens*, Leverkusen.

Strong D.B.

(1964), 'A Greek Silver Head-Vase', *British Museum Quarterly*, 28, 95-102.

Studia Mediterranea

(1979), *Piero Meriggi dicata*, ed. Carruba O., Pavia.

Sullivan R.D.

(1978), 'Priesthoods of the Eastern Dynastic Aristocracy' in *Studien zur Religion und Kultur Kleinasien* (Festschrift für F.K. Dörner), ed. Sahin S. et al., Leiden, 914-39.

Thompson W.E.

(1967), 'Two Athenian Strategoi', *Hesperia* 36, 105-07.

Thomsen V.

(1899), *Etudes lyciennes I*, Copenhagen.

Thomson G.

(1978), *the Prehistoric Aegean*, London, 3rd ed. (reprint of 1961 ed.).

Tischler A. (ed.)

(1982), *Serta Indogermanica, Festschrift für Günter Neumann*, Innsbruck.

Treuber O.

- (1886), *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Lykier*, Tübingen.
 (1887), *Geschichte der Lykier*, Stuttgart.

Tritsch F.J.

- (1942), 'The Harpy Tomb at Xanthos', *JHS* 62, 39-50.
 (1943), 'False Doors on Tombs', *JHS* 63, 113-15.
 (1950), 'Lycian, Luwian, and Hittite', *AO* 1-2, 494-518.
 (1951), 'The Myth of the Chimaera', *Actes du premier Congrès de la Fédération Internationale des Associations d'Études Classiques*, Paris, 279-80.
 (1953), 'Finding a Colossal Head of Apollo and Other Discoveries in Ancient Lycia', *Illustrated London News*, 21/3/53, 448-49.
 (1968), 'Tirynthia Semata', *Kadmos* 7, 124-37.
 (1976), 'The Lycian Bilingual in Stoichedon from Korydalla', *Kadmos* 15, 158-67.

Troxell H.A.

- (1982), *The Coinage of the Lycian League*, *Numismatic Notes and Monographs* No. 162, NY.

Vermeule C.C.

- (1968), *Roman Imperial Art in Greece and Asia Minor*, Harvard.

Wace A.J.B. and Stubbings F.H.

- (1962), *A Companion to Homer*, London.

Walsh J.

- (1981), 'The Authenticity and the Dates of the Peace of Callias and the Congress Decree', *Chiron* 11, 31-63.

Weickert C.

- (1959), 'Neue Ausgrabungen in Milet' in *Neue Deutsche Ausgrabungen im Mittelmeergebiet und im Vorderen Orient*, ed. Boehringer E, Berlin.
 (1959-60), 'Die Ausgrabung beim Athena-Tempel in Milet, 1957', *Ist. Mitt.* 9/10, 1-96.

Weinreich O.

- (1913), *Lykische Zwölfgötter-Reliefs*, Heidelberg.
 (1927) 'Sozon' in *RE* III A, 1, 1248-56.

Wörrie M.

- (1977), 'Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens I', *Chiron* 7, 43-66.
 (1978), 'Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens II', *Chiron* 8, 201-46.

Wurster W.

- (1974), see Borchhardt, 1974.

Yalouris N.

- (1975), *Pegasos, the Art of the Legend*, Mobil Oil Hellas.

Young R.S.

- (1969), 'Old Phrygian Inscriptions from Gordion: Towards a History of the Phrygian Alphabet', *Hesperia* 38, 252-96.

Zahle J.

- (1980), 'Lycian Tombs and Lycian Cities' in *Actes du Colloque sur la Lycie antique*, Paris, 37-49.
 (1982), 'Persian Satraps and Lycian Dynasts. The Evidence of the Diadems', in *Procs. of the 9th International Congress of Numismatics* (Berne, Sept., 1979), Louvaine-La-Neuve, 101-12.
 (1983), *Arkaeologiske studier i lykiske klippegrave og deres relieffer*, Copenhagen.

Zgusta L.

- (1964), *Kleinasiatische Personennamen*, Prague.